

The Catholic University Bulletin.

Vol. XV.

January, 1909.

No. 1.

THE TEACHING OF PHILOSOPHY AT THE UNIVERSITY OF LOUVAIN.

The University of Louvain, founded by John IV, duke of Brabant, was the first university established in the Low Countries. The letter permitting its erection was obtained from Pope Martin V., in 1425. The University opened its doors the following year. Already in the 15th century the new University attained a most prominent position among the centers of higher learning in Europe. All other universities that came into existence in Belgium during the 15th and 16th centuries are tributaries to Louvain, and it maintained its superiority up to the second half of the 18th century.

The teaching of Philosophy at Louvain will form the subject matter of this paper. Let us make clear from the beginning that, according to the custom of the times, various branches of Philosophy were, to a great extent, interwoven with other studies such as Theology, Medicine, Arts. This plan adopted by the mother University at Paris was later on followed by other universities of Europe. If, therefore, from the beginning we find no separate faculty of Philosophy at the University, we should not from this conclude that the "scientia scientiarum" had no place in the curriculum of studies. In reality the ancilla Theologiae played a much more important rôle in the development of the University, than its humble name would indicate. Philosophy was made the basis of the teaching of Theology.

whilst the method of supplementing the study of natural sciences, of Medicine and of Arts by metaphysical research, gave broadness and thoroughness to the University education.

The Scholastic system of Philosophy was taught in this University, as in all other schools of that period. In the 15th century, the philosophy of the Schoolmen was rapidly approaching the period of its complete dissolution. Its Golden Age was a matter of the past. Louvain could not develop men who would be able to infuse new life and vigor into the rapidly declining system of thought. The causes which created this deplorable condition of Scholastic learning at other places, operated strongly at Louvain with the same fatal results. Humanism—the revival of the study of classic literature dealt Scholasticism the first, but by no means the fatal blow. The work of the humanists was destructive, negative; they tore down the ancient structure of Scholasticism, but had nothing to offer in its place. The revival of classic antiquity was concerned primarily with the beauty of the Greek and Latin languages; the adoption of pagan philosophy was rather feared than desired by most influential defenders of the new movement. Thus Erasmus, in a letter to his friend Wolfgang, of Basel, gave expression to misgivings as to the effect of Humanism, which might restore paganism in its entirety: "One doubt still possesses my mind"—he wrote, "I am afraid that under cover of a revival of ancient literature, paganism may attempt to rear its head."¹ Nevertheless, the revival of the study of ancient literature exerted a most vital influence on the history of Scholasticism. The Latinity of the Scholastic authors of that age was barbarous, uncouth, non-classical. Representatives of the humanistic movement, attacking the terminology and language of these writers, fail to distinguish between ideas and the mode of expressing the same, between form and content; they condemn Scholasticism in toto, including in the condemnation even the master-works of the 13th century. In a letter to Thomas Grey, written in Paris in the year 1497, Erasmus gives vent to his feelings against the Paris Theolo-

¹*Epistles of Erasmus*, vol. II, 507; tr. of F. M. Nichols.

gians; he refers to them as men making many discoveries about instances, and quiddities and formalities. "If you have touched literature, you must in their school unlearn what you have learnt. I do my best to speak nothing in fine Latin, nothing elegant or witty."² He referred to these instructors as pseudo-theologians whose language is barbarous, their intellects dull. In another epistle to Ammonius, dated December 29th, 1516, he accused members of the Theological faculty of Louvain of being deficient in their knowledge of Latin and Greek.³ Writing to Wolfgang, of Basel, the "most learned Doctor" Erasmus described the condition of classical learning in the great schools of Europe: "This science" (Theology), he writes, "has been hitherto mainly professed by those who are most pertinacious in their abhorrence of the better literature."⁴

The text-book in Philosophy at Louvain, following the usage of the time, were the Sentences of Peter Lombard, replaced in 1596 by the Summa of St. Thomas. Unfortunately the works of the great Schoolmen were not read in the original. A large number of indifferent commentaries on Aristotle and on the writings of the Angelic Doctor, appeared during the 15th and 16th centuries. These authors were preferred to the masterpieces of Scholastic thought. Dialectic was given a prominence much above its merits. From this period of the decline of Scholastic thought there are handed down to us many useless, frivolous problems or rather subtleties of Logic, not found in the writings of the 13th century. Some notable exceptions to this general mediocrity must be recorded in Louvain. During the 15th century the University counted among its teachers men whose names are held in high honor by adherents of Scholastic Philosophy. John Wiggers, William Mercier, Henry de Loe did noble work in the service of traditional philosophy. Other representatives of Scholastic thought failed to comprehend the true spirit of Scholasticism. Thus Van de Velde opposed the philosophy of Albertus Magnus to Thomism; Henry

²*Ibid.*, vol. I, p. 144.

³*Ibid.*, vol. II, p. 450.

⁴*Ibid.*, vol. II, p. 507.

Someren defended the "subtlest of subtleties" of Scotism. Philosophical learning at Louvain was at an extremely low ebb at the end of the 15th century.

The humanistic movement at Louvain received its impulse from Utrecht through Adrian Boyens, later on Pope Adrian VI., who, in the year 1488, was offered a professorship in Theology. The acquaintance which he made with Erasmus, while still in Holland, soon ripened into intimate friendship. Boyens professed the Scholastic system of philosophy but his sympathies were entirely with Humanism. More influential than Boyens, was the great classical scholar of the age, Erasmus, of Rotterdam. Adrian, then dean of Louvain, invited his friend to take part in the teaching at the University. Erasmus' love of independence, and his desire to spend all his leisure time in the study of classical authors, were probably among the principal reasons of his refusal. The same offer was renewed to Erasmus by Martin Dorpius a few years later, but again without avail.

During his sojourn at Louvain, Erasmus made many intimate friends among men who worked for the same end, strove after the same ideal: to know and to make known Latin and Greek classics. Joannes Paludanus and Martin Dorpius were his most faithful associates in the spreading of new ideas. Thus the influence of Erasmus on the University was considerable. It was largely through his efforts that the College of Three Languages was established there. Latin, Greek and Hebrew languages were given special attention in this institution; the study of Rhetoric and Philosophy was obligatory. Louvain was in fact gradually developing into a home of the Renaissance movement. The hatred of Scholastic terminology and of the Philosophy of the Schools grew in the same proportion in which Humanism gained a foothold at the University. The University authorities did not look with disfavor upon the new order of things as we may conclude from the fact that Martin Dorpius, a most enthusiastic humanist, was in 1523, elevated to the rectorship of the University; the Spaniard, Ludovic Vivés, imbued with the spirit of the Renaissance, but finding an unfruitful field for his labors in his own country, came to Louvain—now the great

centre of the new learning. He was made professor at the University in 1512. His chief title to distinction is his hatred of Scholasticism which he combatted with all the venom of his sarcasm.

The first effects of the Humanistic onslaught were beneficial to traditional philosophy. Representatives of Scholasticism were compelled to defend their position with renewed vigor, with greater skill, with more carefully selected weapons. More attention was given to the language of Philosophy; the proper place was again assigned to Dialectic; philosophy was liberated from many useless adjuncts which had crept into it during the preceding two centuries. Hunnaeus of Mechlin (1522-1577) issued commentaries on the writings of Aristotle and St. Thomas whose correct terminology and classical language was such as to satisfy the most exacting scholar of ancient classics. The same may be said of Valerius, the successor of Hunnaeus, whose work on Dialectic was so highly valued that it was prescribed as a text-book at the University, by Charles V, June 30, 1546. Still in this same edict the weight of royal authority was placed on the side of Humanism, to the great detriment of Scholastic thought. In the catalogue of authors, recommended by Charles, are found names that have become classic in the history of Renaissance movement, names of men distinguished for their opposition to Scholasticism. The place of honor is given to John Cesarius, Augustine Rivius, and Titelmans.

The Renaissance brought the philosophy of Schoolmen into discredit at Louvain, but Cartesianism had the honor of supplanting it in the lecture halls. The system of thought inaugurated by the French philosopher, in a short time brought about a complete revolution in the teaching of philosophy at Louvain. "*Discours de la Méthode*" saw the light of day in 1637. Three copies of the work were at once sent by the author to Plempius who at that time occupied a chair in the faculty of Medicine at the University. The Louvain professor severely criticised the innovator's philosophy; his attacks were directed mainly against that portion of the innovator's Psychology in which the problem of the union of soul and body is

discussed.⁵ Plempius contends that the author's solution of the problem, a revival of Platonism, stands in evident contradiction to numerous well established facts of experience. At this period Plempius and his colleagues, P. Fournet and L. Froidmont, prove themselves champions of Aristotelianism. Plempius in his work "*Fundamenta seu Institutiones Medicinæ*," proves against Descartes that the human soul is the active principle, not only in man's intellectual activity, but in vital functions of the body. In the second edition of the same work (1644) he upholds, with the greatest determination, the Scholastic teaching on the substantial union of soul and body. But in combatting the animal automaton theory of Descartes he goes too far in attributing the power of universal cognition to the brute soul. Still these representatives of Scholasticism, though most determined in their efforts, were unable to stem the tide of Cartesianism, which was rapidly gaining ground among the professors, as well as in the student body. In the 17th century the discoveries of Galileo and Copernicus met with a general acceptance among the scientists at Louvain. The rejection of the Scholastic Astronomy was the natural result of the scientific revival of the age. The representatives of the old mode of thought made the most unjustifiable and most un-Scholastic mistake of antagonizing this scientific movement. In their hands the Scholastic philosophy had in fact become so unwieldy, so lifeless that it could not adapt itself to new conditions, to the changed environment in which it was placed, and, in consequence, it had to leave the field hopelessly vanquished.

An appeal was made to ecclesiastical, as well as civil authorities, to put a stop to the Cartesian innovation at Louvain. Jerome de'Vecchi, papal nuncio at Brussels, took steps to prevent the further propagation of Cartesian philosophy. But the new system had already taken deep root at the University; it had already come into such favor that in response to the first condemnatory communication on the part of de Vecchi, the Uni-

⁵ *Renati Descartes Epistolæ*, vol. I, p. 264 et seq.; vol. II, p. 21 et seq.

versity authorities contented themselves by giving evasive answers, in no way satisfactory to the nuncio. A second brief, couched in severer terms, brought forth the reply that, whilst portions of Cartesian philosophy were untenable, in many points the teaching of the innovator was more conformable to experience, than the mediaeval system of thought.

Gerhard von Gutshoven (1615-1668) was the first to attempt the teaching of Cartesian philosophy at the University. In his capacity as professor of Mathematics little opportunity was offered him to propagate the new system of thought; but in the faculty of Medicine, with which he became affiliated in 1648, he labored with the greatest zeal in the cause of Cartesianism. William Phillipi, instructor in the college of Lyons, was Gerard's most faithful and most successful ally in this undertaking.

The opponents of Cartesianism did not as yet lay down their arms. In 1662 a number of theses taken from Descartes' Psychology and Cosmology were condemned; but these same theses had only a few months previously been publicly defended by a student of Phillipi's course of Medicine.

Towards the end of the 17th and the first part of the 18th century the University was the scene of endless, and useless controversies regarding matters philosophical, Theological and scientific. New discoveries in the field of science frequently constituted the subject matter of heated debates.⁶ Ecclesiastical and civil authorities often interfered in the administration of University affairs; but the University regents asserted their prescriptive right of settling their own differences; when new discoveries arose civil authorities were often called upon to adjust the difficulty. At another time religious orders clashed with the University rulers, who were always ready to guard with jealous care the traditional rights and prerogatives of their institution.

This continuous wrangling, the unceasing disputes had a most disastrous effect on the University. The great centre of learning was rapidly losing its prestige; it was approaching its period of disorganization. Cartesianism won a complete victory over

⁶ See the case of Martin van Velden. De Wulf, *La Philosophie Scolastique dans les Pays Bas*, p. 385 et seq.

Aristotelianism. Among the sixteen professors, who in their diverse faculties taught philosophy in 1671, only two remained faithful to Scholasticism. Attempts were made from time to time, to revive the now obsolete philosophy of the Schools, but the efforts were half-hearted and remained fruitless. Scholastic philosophy at Louvain was a thing of the past.

The interference in the University discipline and in the programme of studies, on the part of Joseph II. of Austria, was the cause of complete disorganization of this institution.⁷ The University was entirely removed from the jurisdiction of the Belgian episcopate and of the Holy See. An independent general Seminary for the Low Countries, subject to Austria, was established at Louvain in 1786; all the bishops were commanded to close their diocesan seminaries and to send all their seminarians to that city. The Holy Ghost College was enlarged to accommodate the large number of the students. The administration, as well as the teaching, was almost entirely in the hands of strangers, sent there for that purpose by Joseph II. The Revolution, finally, suppressed the University, which for centuries had been a distinguished centre of higher education in Europe.

The University of Louvain was reopened in 1814 by the Dutch government. In 1834 it passed into the hands of the Belgian episcopate, with the understanding that its degrees would be recognized by the state, whilst the bishops took upon themselves the burden of securing funds for its support. Cartesianism was, under the new administration, the recognized system of philosophy at the University. Louvain, at this period, was made the home of Ontologism, as taught there by Ubagh, Tits and others.

The Encyclical "Aeterni Patris" issued by Leo XIII. Aug. 4th, 1879, marks a new epoch in the history of Modern Philosophy; beginning with this date the University of Louvain was destined to play a more important rôle in the development of thought, than it had ever done before. By a happy com-

⁷ A. Theiner, *Jean Henri, Comte de Frankenberg et sa lutte pour la liberté de l'Église*, edition of 1852.

bination of circumstances Louvain has come to occupy in recent times the foremost rank among Catholic schools in the effort to revive the philosophy of the Schoolmen. It has the wish of the Holy Father that Thomistic philosophy should be taught in all Seminaries and in all Catholic universities. In a special brief of Dec. 25th, 1880, addressed to the Cardinal Deschamps of Mechlin, the Belgian bishops were urged to establish a chair of Thomistic Philosophy at the University. It was suggested by Roman authorities to engage a Dominican Father for this task, as the order of preachers had preserved in all its purity the teaching of the Angelic Doctor. But the episcopate and the University authorities, determined to guard the secular independence of the institution, proposed Abbé Mercier, a professor in the Seminary of Mechlin, as their choice for the new undertaking. Rome willingly complied with their wish. Before entering upon his new field of labor, Mercier undertook a journey to Rome to receive a plan of studies from the Holy Father himself.

The opening lecture on Neo-Scholastic Philosophy was delivered by Mercier in October, 1882. The discourse was published, in pamphlet form, the same year. He dwells in the lecture on the conditions of the philosophic thought of the age⁸ and points out the distinctive traits of Thomism: the reconciliation of faith and reason; the demonstration that natural and supernatural truth, have the same source, cannot contradict each other; there exists a distinction but no opposition between the two orders. He shows further how St. Thomas was always bent on unifying the data of experience in intellectual speculation. His aim ever was to establish the true relation between natural sciences and philosophy. He elaborated the great Scholastic synthesis, in which facts of science are reduced to harmony and unity, in the higher sphere of Metaphysical principles. As the scientist synthesizes the result of his patient research by formulating laws, so all true philosophy aims at a coördination of all sciences, in the field of principles possess-

⁸*Discours d'Ouverture du Cours de Philosophie de S. Thomas*, pp. 12 et seq.

ing the character of universality. Mercier made these leading thoughts of Thomistic Philosophy his own, and faithfully adhered to them during the twenty-four years of his labor at Louvain.

The project of teaching Thomism at Louvain was in the beginning looked upon by many with apprehension and diffidence. So deeply rooted was the anti-Scholastic feeling, that those in authority considered it necessary to caution the young professor to exercise extreme prudence and the greatest circumspection in the enterprise. Bulky, antiquated tomes of Scholastic Philosophy should not be brought into the lecture rooms; old stereotyped Scholastic formulas should be avoided as much as possible as their use would undoubtedly expose him to ridicule.

Mercier soon succeeded in dispelling from the minds of his hearers all prejudices which they might have entertained against the Schoolmen. His pupils were in a short time convinced that even Scholasticism may be made reasonable and acceptable when presented by a skillful exponent. The proof of Mercier's success was the daily increasing number of hearers, both lay and ecclesiastical.

In his first year Mercier taught Psychology in the faculty of Philosophy and Letters. In this period of his University career Mercier published a lithographed edition of a work on the Freedom of the Will, entitled "Le Determinisme Mechanique et le Libre Arbitre." Then there appeared successively several pamphlets on various philosophical subjects, *e. g.*, *La Parole*; *La Pensée et la Loi de la Conversation de l'Energie*, etc.

From the beginning Mercier entertained the hope of establishing a complete, separate school of Neo-Scholasticism within the University. The founding of the Institut Supérieur de Philosophie in 1891, was in large measure, due to Mercier's success at Louvain and to his influence in Rome. The suggestion of establishing the School of St. Thomas was made by Leo XIII. in a brief to the Primate of Belgium, July 15th, 1888.⁹ A determined effort was made at this time to place the

⁹ Mercier, *Rapport sur les Études Supérieures*, p. 22.

Institute in the hands of a religious community. But the Belgian bishops and the University Senate unanimously decided to place Mercier at the head of the School. The appointment was confirmed by Leo in a letter to Cardinal Goossens, Nov. 8th, 1889.¹⁰ The selection of competent instructors was left entirely to Mercier.

To work with success in the restoration of the Philosophy of the Schoolmen, its exponent must be conversant with the Scholasticism exemplified in the writings of the great Masters of the Middle Ages. But of representatives of the Neo-Scholastic movement is also required a complete acquaintance with modern thought and a thorough familiarity with the scientific achievements of the present day. "Nova et Vetera," the motto chosen by Mercier, expresses the general tendency of the new school. The mediaeval mode of thought is to be adapted to modern conditions; traditional philosophy is to be expressed in language intelligible to contemporary minds; metaphysical principles of the Schoolmen are to be brought into harmony with modern science. Mercier repeats time and again that this is the guiding principle, the object of this Institute. "Analysis is the initial step of all true Philosophy," he says, "synthesis is its natural complement." "Philosophy is by definition the science of things in their universality; in order to arrive at ultimate causes it is necessary to pass through more immediate causes, those that constitute the object of scientific research." Philosophy is the bond of union among sciences; its scope is to synthesize results of scientific investigation and thus to construct a symmetrical edifice of human knowledge. Mercier learned well the lesson so clearly taught in the history of Scholasticism. One of the principal causes of the downfall of the traditional Philosophy was the refusal on the part of its defenders to accept the new scientific discoveries, their reluctance to incorporate them into their system of Philosophy. Mercier made no such mistake. He called to the professorship in the new faculty men, whose scientific training gave them the right

¹⁰*Ibid.*, p. 24.

to speak with authority on matters of science and who have also mastered the spirit of Scholasticism in its Golden Age.

All branches of natural science do not stand in the same immediate relationship to every branch of Philosophy. Whilst the knowledge of some is indispensable, others are only remotely connected with a isolated line of philosophic speculation. Chemistry, Mineralogy, Crystallography are essential for the study of Cosmology, which deals with the essence of matter. A knowledge of Biology, Physiology, Neurology is at present indispensable to the study of Psychology, the philosophical treatise on human nature. These branches of science are taught at the Institute. The courses of Biology, Physiology, Anatomy, Histology, Neurology are intrusted to the care of the respective specialists in the Medical faculty. Furthermore, two ecclesiastics were sent to Germany to perfect themselves in natural sciences. Professor Thiéry, Doctor in Physics and Mathematics, pursued the study of Physiological Psychology under William Wundt at Leipzig, the birthplace of this science. D. Nys, Doctor in Thomistic Philosophy, followed the course of Chemistry under Professor Oswald at the same University.

Professor Thiéry, in his course of Experimental Psychology at the Institute, follows closely William Wundt's valuable work "*Die Physiologische Psychologie*." He acquired in Germany not only a most comprehensive knowledge of this subject; there are even in his lectures unmistakable remnants of the proverbial Teutonic heaviness of style. The laboratory of Experimental Psychology, furnished largely through Thiéry's private funds, is well equipped with apparatus. Experiments are performed by students under the professor's personal direction. Private instructions in the use of instruments are given to students who desire to make a specialty of Experimental Psychology. Several articles and monographs have already appeared, based directly on experiments in this laboratory. A work of considerable value was the result of Mr. Michotte's work in the laboratory, it bears the title "*Les Signes Régionaux*."¹¹

¹¹ Mr. Michotte, a layman, an *agregé* of the School of St. Thomas, is at the present Prof. Thiéry's assistant in the laboratory.

Canon Nys's course is a fair sample of Neo-Scholastic work. He has a thorough comprehension of the spirit of the new movement, is eminently qualified to bring the *Nova et Vetera* into harmonious adjustment. His exhaustive course of Chemistry is made subservient to the study of Cosmology. Laws formulated in Chemistry constitute the basis of cosmological research. Laboratory work, which he superintends in person, is an integral part of the course of Chemistry. Private instructions in special departments of this science are given at the request of students.

A brief course entitled "*Le Problème Cosmologique*," written partly in Latin, was issued by him in a lithographed form; this publication is made the basis of his larger work "*Cosmologie*," which appeared in 1903. This is without doubt, the most comprehensive and the most scientific work that has so far been written on the subject from a Neo-Scholastic point of view.

In the first part of the work the mechanical theory of matter is subjected to a critical examination. Nys establishes a distinction between chemical and philosophical atomism; the former remains within the limits of natural science; the latter claims to solve the problem of the ultimate essence of matter. This philosophical theory—called also Modern Mechanism—is on close examination found to be untenable, because it stands in evident contradiction to well established facts of Chemistry, Physics, Stereo-Chemistry, Crystallography. The ultimate test and the basis of the criticism of a philosophical theory are in this work invariably facts revealed through scientific research; thus science is made the starting point of philosophical investigation. Dr. Nys finds that Aristotelian hylomorphism is not opposed to the latest discoveries in science; in fact, no other philosophical theory on the essence of matter receives such confirmation from science as the oft ridiculed system of "matter and form." The proof of the theses is elaborated with extreme care, revealing the author's complete knowledge of science and his keen comprehension of metaphysical principles. This is the feature of the treatment of all the problems comprised in

his course of Cosmology. Nys's lectures embrace the study of time and space—subjects not embodied in his "Cosmologie;" but two smaller works appeared on these subjects at an earlier date.

Cardinal Mercier's achievements as teacher and author are too well known to need a lengthy exposition. Not only his own country, but all Europe, England, Ireland, North and South America pay homage to his scholarship. Belgium honored itself by making Mercier a member of the Royal Academy; Rome has bestowed upon him the highest dignity within her power by electing him to the college of Cardinals; his appointment on the commission of studies, within the same body, puts the seal of approval on his work at Louvain and offers a wider field for his scholarly influence.

During fifteen years Mercier labored unceasingly, with untiring zeal in the cause of Neo-Scholasticism at the Institute. Despite misrepresentation, contradiction, opposition frequently on the part of those from whom he expected encouragement, he persevered in the good work and achieved remarkable success. His writings are translated into many languages; the number of his pupils is increasing every year; the Neo-Scholastic movement is spreading, is gaining adherents and making itself felt, to such an extent, that men like Eucken, Boutroux and Paulsen, consider it a worthy rival of Kantism. Mercier was undoubtedly more influential, than any other individual scholar, in the restoration of Thomism.

Besides numerous articles in various magazines and smaller monographs, Mercier's writings comprise the following works: *La Logique*; *L'Ontologie*; *La Psychologie*, 2 vols; *Critériologie Générale*; *Les Origines de la Psychologie Contemporaine*.¹²

Examining contemporary systems of thought and studying the dominant tendencies in the Philosophy of the present day, Mercier finds that Cartesianism and Kantism have, in the past two centuries, exerted a most detrimental influence on philo-

¹² We hope that among the many and arduous duties of an archbishop, a Primate and a Cardinal, Mercier will find sufficient time to complete his *Critériologie Speciale*, a work promised some years ago.

sophical studies. The intellectual activity, during this period, has been guided and controlled by the Philosophy of Königsberg, and the system of the French innovator. Their thoughts permeate all branches of Philosophy and non-Catholic Theology even at the present time.

Mercier, in his writings and in the lecture hall, combats the fundamental errors of Kantism and Cartesianism. In his work "*Les Origines de la Psychologie Contemporaine*" he traces the evolution of philosophic thought from the time of the appearance of "*Discours de la Méthode*" to the end of the 19th century. He believes he finds three distinct traits in Modern Philosophy, directly or indirectly traceable to Descartes.¹³ The importance and validity of metaphysical study is minimized and a system of Idealistic criticism is substituted in its place, the result being a tendency to phenomenalism; the alleged antithesis of matter and mind, a remnant of Cartesianism in contemporary thought, leaves the problem of the mutual interaction of soul and body in a state of hopeless confusion; the quantitative aspect of psychic phenomena preoccupies the attention of contemporary psychologists, to a nearly complete exclusion of Rational Psychology. Modern Psychology is purely empirical in its method and in its scope; it is exclusively a branch of natural science and no longer the philosophical study of human nature.

Descartes' system of Philosophy is vitiated by his doctrine of the complete separation of the body and soul in man; the corporeal and the spiritual faculties in man have nothing in common; they constitute two completely separate orders of reality. From this absolute dualism there developed two entirely opposed systems of thought in Modern Philosophy. Idealistic tendencies are already found in Cartesianism, but the system received its complete expression in Berkeley, Hume and Kant. The Mechanistic side of the new Philosophy passed into the Materialism of De la Mettrie and his school. These two movements, so widely divergent, gradually converge and finally coalesce into contemporary Idealism which assumes a

¹³ Mercier, *Les Origines de la Psychologie Contemporaine*, p. 215 et seq.

positivistic aspect in modern Philosophy. As a remedy Mercier advises a return to a system of thought which will not misrepresent the nature of man, but will uphold a most intimate, a substantial union of soul and body; a Psychology which will allow a proper sphere of action to the material, as well as spiritual faculties in man. Experimental Psychology has furnished conclusive proof of the untenableness of a system of thought which relegates all conscious phenomena to the region of purely spiritual realities. Whilst "it is impossible to identify psychic life with functions of nerve centres," still "conditions of sense-activity brought out by Weber have their foundation in the fact that the sensitive faculties are bound to nervous organs."¹⁴ "Sensation is an act of the nervous organ; it is therefore bound in its functions to the chemical and physical conditions of nervous activity."

Thomistic Philosophy assigns to the spiritual and intellectual functions of the human mind their proper place and at the same time it stands in complete harmony with results obtained in the Experimental Psychology. "The acts of sensitive life," St. Thomas often repeats, "do not belong to the soul alone, nor to the body alone; their subject is the combination of both." The human intellect apprehends incorporeal realities; through its powers of abstraction and reflection, this faculty forms abstract ideas and universal principles. Nevertheless it is incapable of exercising these transcendent functions without the coöperation of the material senses.

In the *Critériologie Générale*, Mercier treats Epistemological problems that have arisen in Modern Philosophy since the time of Kant. This work has brought him the highest praise from students of Kantism. Mercier shows in the opening chapter that the human intellect of its own nature tends to the attainment of truth, and that the mind finds its satisfaction and enjoyment in the contemplation of truth. Doubt, uncertainty, hesitation, states in which the mind is kept in suspense and dread,—are not normal conditions of man's cognitive

¹⁴ Mercier, *The Relation of Psychology to Philosophy*, p. 47 (tr. Dr. Wirth), a discourse delivered before the Royal Academy of Belgium.

faculties. The intellect is made for the purpose of knowing truth and of knowing it with certainty. In the exposition of St. Thomas' definition of truth, Mercier brings out more explicitly the content of the definition in paraphrasing it as follows: "Veritas est adæquatio rei jam apprehensæ adeoque intellectui objectæ et intellectus rem prius apprehensam representantis." Certitude is that state in which the mind knows that it is in possession of truth. Now truth can exist only between two terms apprehended by the intellect. The problem of certitude has, then, a twofold aspect: the inquiry into the value of the relation between the subject and the predicate of a judgment, and, secondly, the problem of the objective reality of the two terms of comparison. The criterion of truth, to be worthy of a rational being, must be internal, objective and immediate.

Kant's transcendental criticism is first examined in connection with the first epistemological problem, the objectivity of the relation between the two terms of comparison. The philosopher of Königsberg gives a too restrictive signification to the term analytic judgments, his synthetic *a priori* judgments are, in reality, analytical in the scientific acceptance of the term. There are two classes of analytic propositions: those in which the predicate is a complete or partial definition of the subject: or where the predicate is an *accidens proprium* of the subject. Kant's teaching on categories gives synthetic *a priori* judgments a purely subjective signification. Mercier then proceeds to examine Kant's contention that principles, on which all true knowledge is based, are synthetic *a priori*. He shows that mathematical propositions, laws empirically established, and principles of metaphysics are either the result of direct observation, as laws of science—or else they are accepted by the mind as true because of their objective evidence.

In solving the second epistemological problem, Mercier gives a lucid exposition of the Scholastic theory of abstraction; Kant's teaching on the forms *a priori* is not only obscure and unintelligible, it is self-contradictory. The "Critériologie" further deals with Positivism, the system of "Social Interest,"

the pragmatic movement; Neo-Criticism and Voluntarism are discussed in this comprehensive work. Even problems of Metageometry are treated in this interesting volume.

Mercier's "Psychologie" was written to serve as a text-book in the faculty of Philosophy and Letters. His lectures at the Institute are independent of the published work, the treatment of psychological subjects being more comprehensive and more exhaustive and given partly, at least, in Latin. His method of teaching includes a special treatment of some important psychological problem each year. The topic of more detailed study varies annually—actual problems being generally selected for this purpose. His "Psychologie" is published in two volumes; the subject matter of the first part includes the study of organic and sensitive life; the second volume contains a treatise on the nature of the human soul. The feature of the work is the author's familiarity with the immense literature of the subject; he is acquainted with the latest works published on recent psychological problems in English, German, French, Russian and Spanish. Some leading chapters of the work deserve special mention. His study on the nature and origin of life leaves no doubt as to his first-hand knowledge of biological and psychological subjects. The freedom of the will constitutes the subject of a most beautiful chapter of his work; his arguments against various forms of determinism are forcible and convincing. The relation between sense knowledge and intellectual cognition are handled in a masterly manner. In connection with this subject abnormal states of consciousness are described and explained on principles of Thomistic psychology, hallucination, somnambulism, hysteria, hypnotism, telepathy, spiritualism are some of the subjects dealt with in a most interesting manner.¹⁵

History of Philosophy is not neglected at the Institute. Professor de Wulf, of Louvain, has already won for himself

¹⁵ Since Mercier's elevation to the archbishopric of Mechlin in 1906, Prof. Leon Noël teaches his subjects at Louvain. Noël was especially prepared for this work under Mercier's private tutorship. Mercier's successor on the faculty is a Doctor and an *agregé* of the School of St. Thomas.

an international reputation; he is considered an authority on the history of Scholastic Philosophy. His course at the Institute comprises the entire history of Philosophy, with a detailed study of the origin, development, decline of Scholastic Philosophy and the subsequent attempt at its restoration under the form of Neo-Scholasticism. The Seminar of History of Philosophy, under the direction of de Wulf, offers opportunity for private, original work. This method of giving students encouragement for personal investigation exists in connection with all the principal subjects of philosophy. Suggestions on the selection of subjects, the material to be employed in the preparation of papers, are offered by teachers—but the work is prepared without their assistance. Papers are then read and discussed at the conference, at which all members of the Seminar assemble. The philosophical society of the Institute holds its meetings bi-monthly. A lecture is given frequently by former students of the School, bearing on matters connected with the specialty pursued by the respective graduates. The Alumni gather at the Alma Mater once a year—to keep in close touch with the Institute—and to discuss problems of philosophy. Three original essays are annually offered for discussion at the meeting. The educational value of these societies can hardly be overestimated. Graduates are kept informed of the work done at the Institute, and the students reap the benefit of the practical experience of former students in their chosen professions. A solidarity of action is thus established among the Alumni, lay and ecclesiastical, and the students of the Institute. It is largely owing to this unity of purpose among men of diverse professions, that the Institute is rapidly becoming a powerful factor in the intellectual movement of Belgium.

The School of St. Thomas offers to its students a complete course of Philosophy, an entire synthetic system of thought. In addition to the study of natural sciences referred to above, Philosophical subjects are taught in the following order: Logic, Ontology, Psychology (Experimental and Rational), Criteriology (General and Special), Cosmology, Ethics, Natural Theology, History of Philosophy, Sociology.

In the brief analysis of the work done at the Institut Supérieur, I have endeavored to point out the general tendency, the scope and aim of this School of Philosophy, and the method of arriving at the Ideal held up to Catholic Scholars by the immortal Leo XIII. Mercier clearly understood Leo's plan and possessed the power of infusing this spirit into his associates; he concentrated all the forces at his disposal towards the realization of that one end—to adapt what is true in Scholasticism to modern intellectual needs and conditions, to improve, complete, and correct the old Scholasticism in the light of recent intellectual achievements. Mercier is furthermore a vigorous champion of what Cardinal Newman calls Liberal Education, expressing thereby the principle that the cultivation of the intellect is an end to be pursued for its own sake. Mercier has no sympathy with men who insist merely on the commercial value of education. "Knowledge is worth possessing for what it is, and not only for what it does." The aim of the University education in philosophy should no longer be exclusively apologetic: Catholic Schools should give us "Men who will devote themselves to science for itself, without any aim that is professional or directly apologetic, men who will work at first hand in fashioning the materials of the edifice of science, and who will contribute to its gradual construction." But if original research is desired, the philosophical synthesis of its results is still more necessary. "Particular sciences do not give us a complete representation of reality; they demand and give rise to 'science of sciences,' to a general synthesis—to philosophy." But at the present day when sciences have become so vast and numerous, how are we to achieve the double task of keeping *au courant* with all of them, and of synthesizing their results. Associations must make up for the insufficiency of the isolated individual; men of analysis and men of synthesis must come together and form, by their daily intercourse an united action, an atmosphere suited to the harmonious and equal development both of science and philosophy.¹⁶

JOHN SELISKAR.

THE ST. PAUL SEMINARY.

¹⁶ Mercier, *Rapport sur les Études*, tr. Dr. Coffey, in De Wulf's *Scholasticism, Old and New*.

THE PROMULGATION OF PONTIFICAL LAW.

THE NEW COMMENTARIUM.

On the 29th of September, 1908, Pope Pius X. published a constitution, *Promulgandi*, in which after a brief indication of the nature and forms of the promulgation of papal enactments, he formulated the first general law ever entered in the code of the Church prescribing one exclusive method for the promulgation of the decrees of the Holy See. Beginning with the first of January of the present year, publication in an official journal, to be known as *Commentarium Officiale de Apostolica Sedis Actis*, will be so essential a part of every legislative act that no ordinance, apart from occasional exceptions which the Pope may deem necessary, can have the force of law unless it appear in this journal. Promulgation, so necessary a detail in the making of an article of canon law, must take this specific form. All other methods pass into history.

This Commentarium, which, by the way, is to be not an explanation but a list or record, will also contain other matter than laws. In it will be found all such acts and documents, emanating from the Pope or from the Congregations or Offices of the Roman Curia, as may be of universal interest; and in the set of rules which appeared as an appendix to the *Sapienti Consilio*,¹ the secretaries of the various Congregations are instructed to communicate to the editors of the Commentarium those acts whose promulgation is necessary or whose publication is desirable or useful.

There is no need to emphasize the benefit which such an authentic compilation of present law will be to priests and particularly to those whose pursuits require of them an acquaintance with the most recent pontifical or congregational acts. What a vast amount of time and labor, and, it may be said also, of error, might have been saved if such a publication

¹ *Normae peculiares*, cap. 6, n 1.

had been available during the past few centuries. There has never been anything like it; not surely, the old *Giornale di Roma*; nor the many canonical magazines published by private enterprise; nor the *Osservatore Romano*, which too rarely furnished to its readers the text of laws or of decrees; not even the *Acta Sanctae Sedis*, which, though declared authentic and official since 1904, lacked that completeness which will characterize the new publication. The *Commentarium* meets a general want, and, considered merely as an official compilation of important acts, will occupy a unique place among the sources of canon law.

THE MEANING OF PROMULGATION.

But an immeasurably greater importance will attach to this new journal as a channel of promulgation. In this regard, the constitution *Promulgandi* marks an epoch in legal history, a breaking with the past, the full significance of which can be appreciated only if we go back and trace the doctrine and practice which find, one its complement and the other its term, in Pope Pius' legal innovation.

To the canonist the term promulgation conveys a very specific and technical meaning. It denotes something far more definite and essential than mere publication or notification; it is something different from even the announcement of an enacted law; it is a step in the process of enactment itself. "Leges," says Gratian,² "instituuntur quum promulgantur;" and St. Thomas³ includes promulgation in his definition of a law,—"*quaedam ordinatio rationis ad bonum commune ab eo qui curam communitatis habet promulgata.*" An unpromulgated law is a contradiction in terms. The ecclesiastical law-giver must announce his will to the community before that will can take effect, and it is in this announcement that promulgation consists.⁴

² c. 3, D. 7.

³ I, II, q. 90, a. 4.

⁴ Meyer, *Institutiones Juris Naturalis*, Vol. II, p. 560. "Promulgatio est sollemnis publicatio seu denuntiatio legis nomine legiferae auctoritatis ad communitatem facta."

In the Church, such an announcement is held to be of the essence of law,⁵ for the reason that a law is a rule of action imposed, not on one or another individual or even on all individuals as such, but on the community, and therefore should be notified to the community in an authoritative and authentic way.⁶ The legislator always takes steps to bring the law to the knowledge of the individual members of the Church, but in so doing he is going beyond the requirements of promulgation which regards the society at large and not its component members.

SECULAR PRACTICE.

If we turn our attention from the legislation of the Church to that of the states which make up our nation, we are apt to be at a loss to detect in our secular process of lawmaking any equivalent for this promulgation of which the canonist makes so much. The usual course is for a bill to be introduced in the legislature, to be read three times, to be concurred in by both houses, and after approval by the Governor, to become a law. Very often it takes effect from the date of its passage, and, if a period be fixed before which it shall be inoperative, the action of the legislature is not considered to depend for completion or perfection on anything corresponding to promulgation. The people are making the laws through their representatives and are supposed to need no intimation of what is presumed to be their own action.

This at least is the rule, from which there are but few exceptions, the most notable being in the case of Louisiana which has borrowed from the Code Napoléon and through it from the Civil Law the requirement of promulgation.⁷ The Con-

⁵ St. Thomas, I, II, q. 90, a. 4.

⁶ Suarez, *De Legibus*, I, XI, 1, 3.

⁷ Constitution of Louisiana, art. 40. "No law passed by the General Assembly, except the general appropriation act or act appropriating money for the expenses of the General Assembly, shall take effect until promulgated. A law shall be considered promulgated at the place where the State journal is published the day after the publication of such laws in the State journal, and in all other parts twenty days after such promulgation."

stitution of Indiana⁸ provides that "no act shall take effect until the same shall have been published and circulated in the several counties of the state by authority," and the new Constitution of Michigan⁹ requires that "all laws shall be published in book form within sixty days after the final adjournment of the session." But these requirements cannot be said, even in the case of Louisiana, to enunciate a general principle which regards the essence of the legislative act, absolutely speaking, since the Constitutions of Indiana and of Michigan and of Louisiana permit an act to become law, in certain emergencies, without being published and circulated. Louisiana is really the state which in theory and practice adheres most closely to the doctrine held as sacred by both Roman and Canon Law, and it is the only state save Michigan¹⁰ which makes use of the term in its fundamental law. In the decisions of our courts, the word promulgation is used, in a sense far remote from its technical meaning, to denote any kind of intimation or notification, *v. g.*, of the rules enacted by a manufacturing establishment for the government of its employees.¹¹

The origin of the American practice can be traced back to an English origin. Before the reign of Henry VII, it was customary, at the end of every session of Parliament, to send the King's writ with a transcript of all acts, to the sheriff of each county, with an order that he should take measures to have these acts publicly proclaimed in his county court and laid open there for inspection.¹² But at the same time the rule held that each statute took effect, strangely enough, not from the close of the session, nor yet from the precise date of its passage, but from the first day of the session at which it had been enacted. It was only in the reign of George III that this unjust fiction was mitigated to the extent that a law should

⁸ Art. iv, sect. 28.

⁹ Art. v, sect. 39.

¹⁰ Art. 15, sect. 6.—The Constitution of Wisconsin, Art. vii, section 21, provides that "no general law shall be in force until published."

¹¹ See *v. g.*, the case reported in 18 New York, Supp., p. 769.

¹² Coke, *Institutes*, iii, 41; iv, 26.

operate only from the time when it received the royal assent.

It was easy in a legal system whose origins lay amid such disregard of promulgation to make light of what would appear to be a requirement of natural justice, and we can readily sympathize with the view of Kent¹³ that "it would be more reasonable and just that the statute should not be deemed to operate upon the persons and property of individuals, or impose pains and penalties for acts done in contravention of it, until the law has been duly promulgated."

This remark of Kent confirms the inference drawn above, that the theory which has entrenched itself in our secular law makes the legal vigor of an enactment depend solely on its passage by the legislature, without regard to its formal promulgation. Actually, however, in many of our states, stringent measures have been taken to secure a general knowledge of statutes before they begin to take effect,¹⁴ so that in these states a *de facto* promulgation in addition to that implied in the action of the legislature, may be said to take place; but, I repeat, that any solemn promulgation is not regarded as absolutely essential in the creation of a law is evidenced by the express provisions that a statute may in certain specified cases take effect immediately on passage.

THE HISTORY OF PROMULGATION.

But, to return to the canonical view of this matter, while promulgation is considered to be essential, the method of promulgating Church laws is left to the discretion of the legislator. And no better proof of the liberty enjoyed by ecclesiastical authorities in this regard could be imagined than the varying forms employed by the Popes of the past to bring the

¹³ Kent, *Commentaries*, I, 457.

¹⁴ *E. g.*, No law, except general appropriation act, shall take effect until ninety days after the adjournment of the session at which it was enacted, *unless in case of emergency*: Const. of Texas, III, 39; Michigan, V, 21; South Dakota, III, 22. Until July first after the close of the session, *unless in case of emergency*: Const. of North Dakota, III, 67; Code of Virginia, sect. 4.

Church, the ecclesiastical body-politic, into contact with their decrees. Down to the issuance of the constitution *Promulgandi*, no general law had ever favored one usage rather than another, and any uniformity of practice that obtained was due simply to custom and not to any express regulation.

It is possible, however, to divide the history of promulgation into two great periods, each characterized by a method which prevailed over all others, though not to their utter exclusion. In the collection of examples which Zaccaria¹⁵ searched out from the letters and decretals of Popes from the fourth to the seventeenth century, it is quite evident that for a thousand years the Popes were careful to secure the publication of their decrees not only at Rome but throughout the Church. Whatever may have been the condition of theory at that time, the fact was that sometimes by special messengers sent out from Rome to the provinces, sometimes through the agency of patriarchs, metropolitans, bishops, synods, and even of parish priests, extra-Roman promulgation was insisted on and secured. It is not easy in every case to determine whether what was aimed at was really promulgation and not merely a more general knowledge of the law. In fact, while it appears in many instances that the law was not considered to bind until it had been published locally, it is no less certain that in this earlier period the transmission of a papal act to the bishops of one locality was frequently considered sufficient ground for maintaining that all persons in all places were bound by it. Thus a law which Pope Siricius had directed to bishops in Spain and Africa, was held by Pope Innocent I. to govern the life of the Church in Gaul; and similarly Pope Zosimus, in 418, affirms that legislation which he had previously published in Gaul and Spain was in force in the churches of Illyria. In these cases, which are by no means isolated, publication in one place was considered to justify the presumption of subsequent universal knowledge of the law and of its universal force. It is also to be noted that many of the examples cited

¹⁵ *Dissertationes Latinae*, Vol. II, Diss. XI. From him subsequent writers have borrowed freely. See v. g., Bouix, *De Principiis*, pp. 248 ss.

by Zaccaria and others from the documents of the early middle ages relate to regulations which had a local bearing, or to sentences rendered in particular cases. But promulgation in the provinces is so frequent in the case of general laws until the end of the thirteenth century that this earlier period may very properly be called the period of provincial promulgation.

The circumstances of the time seem to explain its general adoption. Communication was not so easy between nation and nation or city and city as it became later, and hence it was proper that the transmission of knowledge of a law should be promoted by special methods. And, more important still, this method of promulgation had not been invoked to support schism or heresy or to weaken the authority of the Holy See. In any case, it must be remembered that this method was not inseparably bound up with the legislative authority of the Church, and that if circumstances should prompt the Popes to follow another course, their freedom would not be hampered by the practice of their predecessors, who, after all, had given ample proof, even in practice, of their right to dictate the style of promulgating their own enactments.

The second period in the history of promulgation, the period which includes our own time, dates from the pontificate of Martin IV. (1281-1285) and although, like the first period, it furnishes examples of strikingly diverse procedure, the practice prevails of publishing laws at Rome only and dating their legal value from the time of such publication. The first recorded example is found in the constitution "*Michaelem*," published by Martin IV. on Nov. 18, 1281, at Orvieto, whither the strife between Guelph and Ghibelline had driven the Pope.¹⁶ The excommunication decreed in this constitution bore on the Emperor Michael Paleologus, and there being therefore no hope of securing its publication at Constantinople, where promulgation might naturally be expected to be made, the Pope ordered that his decree should be affixed to the principal church in Orvieto. It is true that the act so published was a decree of excommunication rather than a law in the

¹⁶ Zaccaria, p. 207; Schulte, *Die Lehre*, p. 80.

strict sense, but it is precisely the kind of act which had usually been carried for publication to the provinces, and one whose nature would seem to prompt such a course. In any event, here was a method of promulgation which, employed several times by Martin IV.¹⁷ and persevered in by later Popes resident at Rome, became the general rule. Moreover, here also was the motive of this change in procedure, a motive which was to grow in strength as time went on,—the legislative power of the Popes could not be made to depend on the consent or refusal of an irreligious or hostile sovereign or of an insubordinate prelate to permit the public announcement of new laws within his realm or his diocese. Sometimes, an additional reason seems to be suggested in pontifical letters, “*quia difficile foret praesentes litteras ad singula quaeque loca deferri*,”¹⁸ but the fundamental difficulty is always found to lie in the danger that otherwise the law and its purpose would be frustrated. Leo X. uses the clause just quoted in his bull “*Exsurge Domine*”¹⁹ against Luther, which for obvious reasons—the same substantially that held in the case of the Emperor Michael—could not be published at Luther’s place of actual residence; which reasons he refers to explicitly in his letter against Luther in 1521,—“*propter iis faventium potentiam*.” The Pope must legislate, and it must not be in the power of those subject to his laws to escape their effects; if promulgation be, as it is, essential in lawmaking, it must be possible for the Pope to promulgate his laws in such a way as to assure his independence as a legislator, in a way completely and exclusively under his control.

It must not be thought, however, that the method inaugurated by Martin IV. began immediately to prevail and be more common than the older usages with which the Church was familiar. We have to pass through a period of over a century and a half before we meet regularly references to those particular churches and other places of promulgation at Rome

¹⁷ Twice in 1281 and once in 1282.

¹⁸ Calixtus III, Oct. 31, 1457; Nicholas V, March 26, 1448.

¹⁹ June 15, 1520.

which have since, up to the first of the present year, been so frequently mentioned in Apostolic decrees. But in the fifteenth century, promulgation at Rome comes ordinarily to mean the reading of a decree in one or more of the principal churches of the city, and the affixing of copies to the doors of the church or churches and in other offices and public places. Probably the fact that laws of immediate interest to the residents of Rome or affecting the temporal dominion of the Holy See had been thus read and affixed at St. Peter's, or the Capitol, or the Chancery,²⁰ contributed to the adoption of this particular style; or it may be possible to trace an earlier origin in the ancient Roman usage of inscribing laws on tablets of wood or bronze and posting them in some place of public resort.²¹

Regularly the portion of the decree providing for promulgation ran that the full text of the law was to be read²² by cursors in St. Peter's and St. John Lateran at a time when the people were assembled there, that immediately the texts which had been read should be left affixed to the doors of these churches and later should be replaced by copies. Sometimes it was ordered that additional copies should be posted in the Apostolic Chancery, in the public square known as the Campo di Fiori, and occasionally in the Curia Innocentiana. St. Peter's and St. John Lateran came to be the preferred churches in this connection, but St. Mary Major was sometimes included. The details were not always the same; the *Dominici Gregis* of Pius IV. was affixed only at St. Peter's and St. John Lateran; the *Dum pro communi* of Sixtus V. was posted at St. Peter's, St. John Lateran, and the Campo di Fiori; the *Dei miseratione* of Benedict XIV. at St. Peter's, the Lateran, the Chancery, and Campo di Fiori; the *Cum primum* of Pius VI. at St. Peter's, the Chancery, the Curia Generalis and

²⁰ Eug. IV, *Cum Vectigalia*, and *Divina*.

²¹ Krueger, *Geschichte der Quellen des römischen Rechts*, p. 23; Landucci, *Storia del Diritto Romano*, Vol. I, p. 64.

²² This public reading gradually became unusual.

Campo di Fiori.²³ Recently we have seen more than one law promulgated in a secretariat of the Curia. But this variation in detail was of no importance; the essential fact remained the same in every case that the law, by reason of its publication at Rome, was held to be promulgated, and went into effect immediately if no delay were granted in the decree itself.

Promulgation at Rome became the rule, but the rule itself was still under the control of the legislator, and therefore exceptions were possible. The famous chapter *Tametsi* of the Council of Trent is perhaps the best known example, requiring special promulgation in each parish before it could take effect. But it does not stand alone. The brief *Dominus ac Redemptor* in which Clement XIV. decreed the suppression of the Society of Jesus required not only a local or provincial but a personal promulgation; it was to go into effect for particular houses only after it had been published therein by specially appointed agents; and it is owing to this fact that in some localities suppression was never effected. The *Romanos Pontifices* of Leo XIII., which has been of so much importance for us since its extension to this country in 1885, was promulgated not in Rome but in England; and the *Ne Temere*, which recently gave us new law on the form of marriages and engagements, was promulgated by its mere transmission to the Ordinaries of the various dioceses throughout the Church. These examples are but a few out of many which demonstrate that the validity of promulgation was not considered to be dependent on any one form, no matter how frequently that form might have been employed.

CONFLICT OF THEORY.

We search in vain in the writings of modern canonists and theologians for any evidence of a desire to question the sufficiency of Roman promulgation, or to insist on the necessity of a return to the practice of eight hundred years ago. There

²³ In Art. IX of the Law of Guarantees the Italian Government affirmed the liberty of the Pope to publish his acts by affixing them to the basilicas and churches of Rome.

is now but one theory, with no rival probable or even less common opinion to contest its right to supremacy. But this unanimity did not always prevail. In the history of Canon Law some distinguished names are found among the adherents of a by no means contemptible school which long held out for the necessity of provincial promulgation. We can see their influence in Suarez's²⁴ statement, reflecting the condition of canonical thought in his day, that authors are not of one mind as to the necessity of promulgation in particular dioceses, and also in his unwillingness to say more for what has become the only accepted opinion, than that it is more commonly held. It is this *communis recepta opinio* which he himself adopts and proves at some length, but then and at a later day not a few writers of the rank of Molina, Billuart, Engel and Pichler were no less firm in their adhesion to the view which the author of the great work *De Legibus* had rejected. Their theory of the necessity of provincial publication long continued to be a probable opinion.

In view of the fact that this opinion, once probable, is no longer regarded as such, two questions naturally suggest themselves,—what were the arguments on which its probability was considered to rest, and why was it that in the course of time what was once held as probable came to be considered by all as absolutely improbable.

If we take up any of the authors mentioned above²⁵ as champions of provincial publication we shall find them making much, not of a text from the *Corpus Juris Canonici*, but from a Constitution of Justinian. In his sixty-sixth Novella the Emperor introduced a special form of promulgation for enactments relating to wills. Such enactments were to be published not only at Rome, but also in the provinces, and their effects were to date from two months after the time when they were proclaimed locally. This, it is true, was a law of the empire and not of the Church; but the principle had long been accepted, and had even received recognition in papal decrees,²⁶

²⁴ Lib. iv, Cap. 15, n. 1.

²⁵ *E. g.*, Pichler, Lib. i, Tit. 2.

²⁶ Cap. i, de novi operis nunciatione.

that recourse might be had to the civil law to meet a case not covered by the canons. Here precisely seemed to be need of such recourse, for no general law of the Church could be found determining the method of promulgation.

The fact that Justinian's Novella had reference only to testamentary matters was overcome by calling attention to the rubric affixed to it which extended the law to all *novae constitutiones*, and to the reasons alleged in the body of the text, which seemed to hold good for all laws. Moreover in a later Novella ²⁷ Justinian applied the rule adopted in Novella 66 to non-testamentary matters, and herein was found a new argument for elevating a particular rule into a general principle of law.

Weak enough this argument appears to us now, but its power was not to be despised at a time when to be a complete canonist meant to be a thorough civilian also, and when men eagerly searched both Corpora to decide a controversy in church law. Here was a matter on which no text of the canon law shed light; but a pertinent decision, framed by a Roman Emperor and inserted in the currently received copies of the imperial collection of law, lay ready at hand. So it was inevitable that many would accept as of necessity the conclusion that when any papal decree made no provision as to the manner of its promulgation, it would have to be promulgated in the provinces as well as in Rome. The Popes had accepted the Roman Law in a general way for such cases, and had therefore subjected the exercise of their authority to this condition.²⁸ It would be easy enough to prove, so it seems to us now, from the Roman Law itself that no one method of publication had been recognized as of general, absolute necessity. The sixty-sixth Novella is not the sole instance of legislation on this subject. In various parts of the Corpus Juris Civilis different rules had been laid down,²⁹ the logical inference from which would seem to be that Roman Law furnished no sufficiently definite guid-

²⁷ Nov. 116.

²⁸ Pichler. Lib. I, Tit. II, n. 21.

²⁹ E. g., L. 55, C. de decurionibus; Novella 66, 116.

ance to serve as a supplementary source in this connection. But at the same time, it must be confessed that this absence of a certain clear rule in either Corpus furnished the occasion for controversy and allowed a variance of opinion.

We have to go out of the realm of theory into that of practice to answer the second question raised above, and explain why the arguments in favor of the necessity of provincial publication were finally divested of all probability. We have here one of those instances, by no means rare in the history of legal controversy, where the practical application of a teaching has been the best test of its truth or falsity. It was discovered in the course of time that the opinion requiring provincial publication lent itself to the designs of those who might desire to render a papal law of no effect in one or another locality. This was made strikingly evident during the pontificate of Alexander VII.

On Sept. 24, 1665, this Pope published a list of condemned propositions, covering many questions of doctrine and discipline, three of which were destined to receive a certain adhesion in some quarters despite the papal condemnation. Two of these related to Mass stipends, and the third to the right of members of mendicant orders to absolve from cases reserved to a bishop without having been empowered for this purpose by the Ordinary. An attempt was made to evade this decree on the pretence that the condemnation, having been announced only at Rome, was without effect outside the Roman province. This argument served only to bring the opinion of which it was the latest expression into disrepute. It was clear that in this case Roman promulgation was sufficient, and immediately the cry was raised that here was satisfactory evidence that extra-Roman promulgation was not necessary. In this instance the application to a practical case had served as a boomerang. It began to be asserted that the theory of provincial publication was no longer probable.

In February of the same year, Alexander VII. saw his efforts to stem the tide of Jansenism rendered futile, in part at least, by the refusal of some of the bishops of France to publish a

papal bull within their jurisdictions. Here was the test which really settled the fate of provincial publication. The Church in France had some time before entered on a novel course. In more than one locality the Breviary and the Missal were translated into French, and the Latin texts abandoned; a ritual in French had been adopted; devotion to the Blessed Virgin had been discountenanced; the practice of the universal Church in regard to the Sacrament of Penance had been condemned and rejected; and theories and usages relative to the Eucharist which savored not only of novelty but of dogmatic error had received favor in high quarters. It was in defence of such enormities that provincial publication was to exhibit its real weakness and prove itself really irreconcilable with the true idea of Papal power.

For, more fundamental than the question whether any particular form of ritual or breviary or missal might be retained, or even than any novel theory as to one sacrament or another, was the question whether the Church was to remain one in doctrine and discipline, subject to one legislative head, or was to be split into as many sects as there were dioceses. Unity of any kind was impossible if the theory of provincial publication were to be followed to its logical consequences. The Pope would no longer be a universal legislator, confirming all his brethren and guiding his entire flock. Rebellion would be a right. Legislative authority would not be vested plenarily and in a supreme degree in the Roman Pontiff but in his subordinates. These consequences needed but to be brought home by such occurrences as attended the Jansenistic outbreak to reveal the true character of the principle from which they sprang and to render orthodox opinion unanimously and absolutely hostile to it. The theory of provincial publication became a weapon against the legislative authority of the Popes and consequently against the divine constitution of the Church. It served every bad cause, Gallicanism and Febro-nianism and Eybellianism. It was unsound and therefore it was rejected by all.

But how did it happen that the same theory which was dear

to Jansenists and Gallicans was also preferred by many of the orthodox school, and was defended by the Dominican Billuart and the Jesuit Pichler as well as by Van Espen and De Marca? First, the motive of each school of writers was as diverse as can well be imagined. Billuart³⁰ and Pichler, to take them as examples, were solicitous that the law might be better known and its observance furthered. Van Espen and De Marca, on the other hand, aimed at preventing the operation of a law unwelcome in any particular locality, and thus defeating the will of the supreme legislator of Christendom. Again, Catholic writers who defended the now abandoned theory did not deny the possibility of a law affecting the entire Church after promulgation at Rome—Billuart expressly says, “pariter fate-mur sic esse quando ex causa urgente ita mandant et exprimunt SS. Pontifices”—their contention was that when the Pope had published a law at Rome without declaring for or against provincial promulgation, it would have to be presumed that he had made the obligation of the law in other places dependent on local promulgation. We are here, clearly, very far from the opinion of Van Espen and his brethren who set up the requirement of diocesan publication as a bar to papal authority. One school sets forth what it believes to be the will of the Pontiff, the other combats his explicit decree.

If Billuart's theory had not long ceased to be probable, it would lose all probability after the appearance of the constitution *Promulgandi*. Therein extra-Roman promulgation is expressly declared to be unnecessary. By insertion in the *Commentarium*, and by that means alone, laws receive their promulgation. This is the rule, and if exceptions are to occur explicit mention of them will be made in each case. The will of the Pope has no longer to be presumed; there is no need to wrest from the civil law texts of doubtful pertinence; we have at length, for the first time in ecclesiastical legal history, a general law on this important matter, one which leaves no ground for diversity of interpretation.

³⁰ *De Legibus*, Diss. III, Art. III, pars I.

DECREES OF ROMAN CONGREGATIONS.

The new constitution also settles a question which had long vexed theologians and canonists, and which had proved so perplexing to St. Alphonsus³¹ that he found it necessary to retract the answer which he had originally given it. This question related to the decrees of Congregations. The lawmaking power of several Congregations is quite evident. But when this power was exercised, and decrees introductory of new legislation were framed, it was usually difficult to detect any trace of promulgation. That a Congregation had made this or that law or given this or that decision was quite certain; it bore all the marks of authenticity; but had it been published to the universal Church? Certainly not after the solemn fashion in which pontifical enactments were wont to make their appearance. These congregational decrees were framed in the office of the Congregation, and no promulgation took place beyond what might be conceived to happen in a secretariat in the presence of a few officials.

Some, confronted with what they believed to be an unpromulgated and yet binding law, were driven to the necessity of denying that promulgation was an essential requirement of law, in their desire to allow the decision of the Congregation to take effect.³² Others, insisting on the necessity of promulgation, held that full authority could not be ascribed to the decision until a formal promulgation had occurred or at least until the decision had been incorporated in the *stylus curiae*.³³ Finally a third school, best represented by Lega,³⁴ maintained that promulgation was verified, at least substantially, inasmuch as it was quite clear that the law or decree, issued with every mark of authenticity and made a matter of public knowledge, had been officially brought to the notice of the community.

³¹ *Theol. Mor.*, Lib. I, n. 106; *Elenchus Quaest. Reform.*, Lib. I, n. 116.

³² Bouix, *De Curia Romana*, p. 295.

³³ Wernz, *Jus Decretalium*, I, n. 146.

³⁴ *De Judiciis*, II, p. 353.

This controversy has no longer any actual interest. Decrees emanating from the Congregations must be promulgated in the *Commentarium* or fail to take on the character of Law.

The new constitution is silent as to the moment when the promulgated law goes into effect, and consequently the question suggests itself, does this mean that all persons throughout the Church are immediately affected by a law which appears in the official journal of the Holy See? It would seem that this must be the case, unless some delay be granted in the text of the enactment. Any law, after promulgation, is perfect; it is a rule of action for all members of the social body for which it is made. An ecclesiastical law as soon as promulgated is adapted to govern action in the universal Church.

This opinion is now generally received, and is supported by at least one decision of the Holy Office³⁵ and another of the *Poenitentiaria*,³⁶ but a considerable number of authors, especially of those who wrote before the nineteenth century, can be cited³⁷ who maintain that the extra-Roman operation of a law does not begin until two months have elapsed from the date of publication at Rome. Among these is a writer of so high repute as St. Alphonsus,³⁸ whose influence is seen in the earlier editions of Gury. But this view has always been less common. However, it was not without some shadow of support in legal texts. Pope Pius IV, in the constitution *Sicut ad sacrorum* in which he fixed the period when the decrees of the Council of Trent began to bind, declared expressly that the common law had prescribed that new ordinances were to go into effect only after a certain time. This clearly implied that somewhere was a text providing for delay, but in vain was such a text sought in ecclesiastical law. No Pope had ever made such a provision. The only legal declaration at all cor-

³⁵ June 15, 1870.

³⁶ November 8, 1821.

³⁷ See *v. g.*, Schmier, *Lib. I, Tr. I, n. 202*.

³⁸ *Theol. Moralis, De Legibus*, n. 96. Lyndwood, the celebrated English canonist of the fifteenth century, held this opinion. See his *Provinciale*, p. 51.

responding to the words of Pius IV was contained in the sixty-sixth Novella of Justinian, quoted above, which made a delay of two months a necessary preliminary to the effectiveness of the law. On this text, therefore, a doctrine was based, a doctrine which, it was said, was more conformable to natural justice and prevented the faithful from being bound by a law before they could possibly know of its existence.

But all the arguments that were valid against this much cited Novella when it was invoked to defend provincial publication, served also to deprive it of conclusive value in this other connection, and the sanction of the common law to which Pius IV referred remained undiscoverable. A solution had to be found in the practice of the Holy See, and this practice was, according to the testimony of those best acquainted with it, in favor of the immediate effectiveness of promulgated laws. Here was an indubitable argument to be set over against a civil law text of doubtful value,—it is not a matter of wonder that it won wider adhesion.

Nor is there any great danger that injustice or hardship will result from this practice or from the universal acceptance of the theory which it countenances. In many instances, in fact whenever injustice would otherwise result, the Holy See marks an interval between the promulgation of a law and its operation. And when this is not considered necessary the greatest care is always taken to secure at once a general knowledge of the action taken by the legislator. Before this present year, all acts of importance were at once communicated to every bishop of the Church, and ignorance of the law was thus rendered inexcusable. Every vestige of possible injustice disappears when we remember that a commonly accepted opinion permits a judge to presume in offenders ignorance of a penal law until a sufficient time has elapsed to allow knowledge of it to reach the locality over which he has jurisdiction.

From this study of one papal constitution more is to be gathered than a brief rule of law. We not only learn how laws are to be promulgated in the future; we have a revelation also of the spirit which will inform the entire work of codifi-

cation of which this present decree is so small a part. We see here the institutions of the past perfected and readjusted to modern conditions; we can understand thoroughly and appreciate fully the present only if we are familiar with the past. And so it will be, we may well believe, with the new code as a whole when it is completed. What we shall behold is not a new creation, unseen and unknown before, but old and familiar things in a new guise. There will be a lopping off here and an addition there; some laws will be abrogated and some retained and others will work within narrower limits; but when we examine the work in its entirety or even in any of its great sub-divisions, we shall be able to say that what has come to us in the form of new law is really the development of that with which we have always had to deal. So it was with the new marriage law, so it was with the reorganization of the Curia, so it is with this constitution *Promulgandi*. So it must be with all important rules that affect the life of so essentially a conservative institution as the Church.

JOHN T. CREAGH.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

Bullarium Romanum, passim.

ST. THOMAS: *Summa Theologica*, I, II, q. 90, a. 4.

SCHULTE: *Die Lehre von den Quellen des Katholischen Kirchenrechts*. P. 76 ss.

ZACCARIA: *De Rebus ad Historiam atque Antiquitates Ecclesiae pertinentibus Dissertationes Latinae*. Vol. II, Diss. XI.

SCHERER: *Handbuch des Kirchenrechts*. Vol. I, p. 163 ss.

SUAREZ: *De Legibus*, L. III, c. XVI: L. IV, c. XV.

BOUQUILLON: *Theologia Moralis Fundamentalis*. P. 270 ss.

MEYER: *Institutiones Juris Naturalis*. Vol. II, p. 560 ss.

VAN ESPEN: *De Promulgatione Legum Ecclesiasticarum ac speciatim Bullarum ac Rescriptorum Curiae Romanae*.

BOUX: *De Principiis Juris Canonici*. Pars II, cap. VI.

PHILLIPS: *Kirchenrecht*. Vol. V, p. 54 ss.

BOUQUILLON: *De l'époque à laquelle commence l'obligation des lois dûment promulguées*.

Canoniste Contemporain. Vol. III, p. 121. La promulgation diocésaine des lois pontificales.

ST. ALPHONSUS: *Theologia Moralis*, Lib. I, n. 95 ss.

BALLERINI-PALMIERI: Vol. I, p. 265, and Appendix II.

Also commentators on the Decretals, in their treatment of Lib. I, Tit. II; and moral theologians in the treatise *De Legibus* under *promulgatio*.

INNOCENT XI (1676-1689), LIBERATOR OF HUNGARY.

This study of one beneficent phase of a great Pope's life is based on the excellent Hungarian monograph of the learned ecclesiastical historian, William Fraknói, *Pope Innocent XI and the Liberation of Hungary from the Turkish Yoke*, published on the occasion of the second centenary (1886) of the liberation of Buda.¹ Fraknói gathered the material for his book mostly from the Vatican archives; in his preface he thanks Árpád Károlyi for having supplied him with additional matter from the archives of Paris and Vienna. From this work we learn the truly marvellous story of the liberation of Hungary, and realize also the prolific energy of one of the most prominent of modern popes in the struggle of Europe against the Osmanli power, which threatened the welfare of that continent and its Christian civilization. We may say at once that the learned work of Fraknói is worthy of the pope to whom, in grateful remembrance, the scholarly editor has dedicated it.

In view of the danger that threatened the Christian world on the part of Islam, grown so powerful in Asia and Africa, the popes were always the first to realize the necessity of organizing a common defence. From the dawn of the second millennium the constant effort of the Apostolic See was to unite Christian rulers in aggressive expeditions, that they might measure arms with the powerful enemy on Asiatic soil.

The struggle between the Turkish power and Christianity began in the reign of Sylvester II (999-1003). While on the one hand, he was ever willing to protect the weaker countries of the West against the avarice of the more powerful, he was, on the other hand, the first to cast his eye upon the Orient and to sound the tocsin of a crusade for the deliverance of Jeru-

¹ German translation: *Papst Innocenz XI, und Ungarns Befreiung von der türkischen Herrschaft*, von Wilhelm Fraknói, etc., (Freiburg im Br. 1902).

salem.² Gregory VII (1073-1085) and his successor took up his work and continued it with zeal and enthusiasm. Crusade after crusade was made to the Holy Land in order to free the native land of our Saviour from the hands of the infidels or at least to weaken their power to such a degree as to deliver Europe from its constant fear of invasion by their plundering hordes. However, in spite of the ceaseless activity and zeal of the popes, their efforts were not altogether successful; for as soon as the Christian armies were withdrawn from the Holy Land to regain their strength, or on account of some enmity between the leaders, immense armies of Moslems appeared regularly on the frontiers of Europe spreading everywhere devastation and ruin.

One of the first results of the Lutheran reformation, during which the European powers wasted their strength against one another, was an increase of military activity on the part of Islam, then fresh from the conquest of Constantinople. Taking advantage of the internal troubles of Europe, the Sultan hoped to plant the Crescent in all the centers of Christendom. The disastrous battle of Mohács (August 29, 1526) delivered into the hands of the Turks the greater part of Hungary; after a few more years of burning and plundering, Sultan Suleiman succeeded in taking Buda (1541) the strongest fortress of the Magyars. Then began one of the greatest national conflicts known to history, the struggle of the Magyars against the Turkish yoke, which lasted well-nigh two centuries (1526-1685).

The Osmanli, however, were not satisfied with the subjugation of Hungary alone. They aimed at bringing the whole of Europe under Turkish domination. Now that they had succeeded in securing a European foothold, they looked abroad over the other Christian nations, and awaited only an opportunity to hang about their necks the heavy Ottoman yoke.

There was waged upon Hungarian soil for a century and

Epistle 219, *Ex persona Hierosolymae devastatae ad universalem Ecclesiam*, Jaffé, Reg. RR. PP., I., 3938; Migne, P. L. CXXXIX, 208; *Olleris Œuvres de Gerbert* (Paris, 1867), p. 149.

a half an almost continuous struggle between Islam and Christendom. Owing to the mutual jealousy of the European rulers, who often turned their arms from the common foe upon one another, all efforts to shake off the odious domination proved fruitless. Finally hostilities between the ambitious Louis XIV and Emperor Leopold I of Austria reached such a pitch that they resulted in open war. John Sobieski, king of Poland, was left alone to carry on the war against the Turks, but unable to obtain the help promised by the other powers, he was forced to conclude a treaty of peace with the sultan (1676). Kara-Mustafa, the warlike and ambitious grand vizier, viewed with delight the bitter enmity of France and Austria, and did all in his power to heighten it. The opportunity so long awaited by the Ottoman power came at last, and the Sultan determined to take advantage of it. However, just as the infidels were preparing to overwhelm the Christian world and to deal a death blow to Hungary, an ever-watchful Providence prepared a new and a mightier leader to ward off the threatening danger and to crush forever the power of Turkey in Europe. Several popes had already manifested much self-sacrificing zeal in this good cause, but none was more energetic than Benedetto Odescalchi, who ascended the papal throne September 21, 1676, under the name of Innocent XI. He was descended from a family of wealthy bankers in Como. From his youth he longed to fight against the infidels, and was inclined to enter upon the career of a soldier; accordingly he went to Poland where he took part in a number of battles.³ At twenty-five he went to Rome, was ordained priest, and made such rapid progress in ecclesiastical

³ It is regrettable that we possess no exhaustive biography of Innocent XI. (Concerning his youth, no fact is known as certain. Many historians even doubt that he ever intended to become a soldier). The four-volume work of E. Michaud: *Louis XIV et Innocent XI, d'après les correspondances diplomatiques inédites du Ministère des affaires étrangères de France* (Paris, 1882), the most extensive work that has so far appeared about this pope, is based on prejudiced and inimical documents, i. e., it rests exclusively on the reports of French ambassadors and consuls, the bitter enemies of the pope, and therefore unfit to be his judges.

dignities that in 1645 he was created cardinal. His moral blamelessness and religious zeal won for him universal respect; in his election to the papal throne the only cardinal who opposed him saw "a most remarkable working of the hand of God."⁴

The expectations centered upon him were fulfilled by the very first acts of his reign. At the time of his accession, the treasury of the Holy See was heavily in debt. By the dismissal, however, of superfluous officers and by his economical mode of life, he not only paid off the pontifical debts, but rendered it possible, as we shall see, to collect millions of florins for the war against the Turks. "There was a general surprise, when breaking with nepotism, which the practice of a century had developed into an authorized institution, he kept his only nephew at a distance from the papal court and denied him the usual favors." To put an end to all strife between Christian princes, to unite them against the Turks, and to free Christendom from their yoke, was through his entire reign the sole aim of all his efforts. Towards this goal he advanced with steady endurance, nor did he allow himself to be diverted from it by seeming impossibilities, by bitter disappointments, or by tempting momentary advantages. His manner of life, his beneficence, and his great patience won for him universal respect. Shortly after the pope's death, a French traveller, resident in Rome, writes: "The reverence felt in Rome for the dead pope has reached such a degree, that many turn to him in their prayers and even assert that miracles have taken place at his tomb."⁵ At a later date, Benedict XIV declared him "Venerable," and thus opened the way to his future canonization.

The first political act of Innocent was to restore peace between Louis XIV and Leopold I. He knew too well that he could do nothing against the Ottoman power so long as hostilities existed between the Christian rulers. After three years

⁴Michaud, *op. cit.*, I, 18, 19, 50.

⁵Jean Dumont, *Voyages en France et Italie* (1699), I, 287.

of ceaseless endeavor, he had the satisfaction of seeing his efforts crowned with success. Through the fidelity and untiring labor of Buonvisi, his nuncio at Vienna, peace was concluded at Nimwegen, February 5, 1679, between France and Austria. Thereupon Innocent XI took up with renewed zeal, the matter of a war against the Turks. The opportunity seemed favorable for Sobieski. This king and Feodor III, the Czar of Russia, had concluded peace the summer before, and the latter was now waging war against the Turks. The pope endeavored to bring about an alliance between the Emperor and the King of Poland against the Ottoman power, and called on France for aid to carry on the war successfully. But the imperial court could not be won over to the papal project. In vain did Buonvisi point out to the Emperor and his ministers the advantages of a successful war; in vain did they show that the war between Turkey and Russia furnished the long desired opportunity of driving the former out of Europe and forever. All the endeavors of Innocent failed, being met by excuses and evasions on the part of the ministers.

While Vienna replied so coldly to the papal advances, Poland showed a better spirit. The idea of an alliance against the Turks was there taken up with enthusiasm. In a Diet held at Grodno it was decided that full reparation should be made to the Emperor for the injuries he had suffered on the part of those who aided the Hungarian rebels, and the Poles determined to enable Sobieski to commence the war, provided that he was assisted and supported by the other European rulers. The nobles wished to draw up and conclude an alliance offensive and defensive; accordingly plenipotentiaries were sent to Rome, to Vienna, and to Paris. The answer of Louis XIV was that former popes had tried to unite the European powers against the common enemy and had failed; it would therefore be an act of folly on his part to encourage so vain an undertaking.⁶ Leopold, who was anxious to break the existing friendship between France and Poland, listened more

⁶ Letter of Louis XIV to his ambassador at Warsaw, December 14, 1679. Walisewski, II, 347.

willingly to the proposals of Sobieski, and returned the answer that he was willing to conclude an alliance, but for mutual defense only.⁷ Buonvisi and the nuncio at Warsaw were unceasing in their efforts to bring their respective courts to an agreement.

To realize the defensive and offensive alliance, however, the Holy See had to exert much diplomacy, for the obstacles were many and great. Louis XIV was not content with refusing his own assistance but did all in his power to thwart the projected alliance of Poland and Austria and to win Sobieski over by presents and promises. Sobieski himself meditated an expedition against Russia, hoping thereby to gain the Russian throne for his eldest son. The solution of these difficulties fell to the nuncio at Warsaw. This was Pallavicini, archbishop of Ephesus, and he displayed no less zeal than his predecessor Martelli, archbishop of Corinth, in bringing about the Austro-Polish alliance.⁸

About this time Innocent XI turned his attention to the affairs of Hungary, and directed Buonvisi to use all possible means to restore peace and quiet. Accordingly the nuncio convened a diet at Sopron, for April 23, 1681, in order to give both parties a chance to set forth their grievances. Before the diet he asked the Emperor to be liberal in his concessions to the Protestant rebels for the sake of internal peace; this "open sore," he says, "is the principal cause of the German nations not joining the war against the Turks. Even in this, to use the words of our excellent author, "that great idea was ever before his eyes, namely, to make the war against

⁷ Report of the French ambassador at Warsaw, September 28, October 29, November 17, 1679, I, m. 291, 304, 309.

⁸ He did not keep this a secret from the French ambassadors, who on February 25, 1681, wrote to Louis XIV: "Il (Pallavicini) nous dit qu'il travailloit uniquement à porter ce Royaume à se mettre en etat d'une défense raisonnable contre le Turc en augmentant considérablement leur armée, mais que si on ne le vouloit pas faire, il ne voyoit pas qu'on dust refuser le secours de l'Empereur, qui avoit tant d'intérêt à la conservation de ce Royaume." In the report of April 17, 1682, they declare that the nuncio takes more interest in the affairs of the Emperor than the imperial ambassador himself. Walisewski, III, 107, 205.

Turkey possible and successful by satisfying the Hungarian nation." The result of the diet, however, was unsatisfactory. The concessions demanded by Tököli, the leader of the Protestant rebels, would have been prejudicial to the Catholic Church in Hungary. Nor was the rebel leader anxious to have peace. Encouraged by the hostile attitude of France towards Austria, and by the promised aid of the Turks, he continued his devastations throughout Hungary and the surrounding countries. Under the guise of patriotism he was merely sacrificing his country to his own ambition. He was willing to reduce Hungary to a Turkish province, provided he could be its governor.⁹

In acknowledgment of the zealous activity shown by Buonvisi at this diet, the pope rewarded him by raising him to the cardinalate, September 1, 1681. This acknowledgment spurred him on to still greater efforts in behalf of the alliance. Finally, when in the autumn of 1682, the imperial court learned that the Sultan intended to send an invading army into Europe the following year, Buonvisi attained his end. The ministers unanimously voted for the alliance. At the same time Buonvisi convinced Sobieski of the fact that under the existing circumstances a war against Russia was unseasonable. He repeatedly requested the nuncio at Warsaw to do his utmost to consolidate the peace between the two countries and to dispel all mutual suspicion that might exist between them; for he says, "on this depends the good of Christianity and the fulfillment of the holy wishes of the pope."¹⁰

At the Polish diet, which had been convened to decide the matter, Count Waldstein announced that the emperor was willing to make the alliance both *defensive* and *offensive*. Whereupon Pallavicini having declared that the pope was willing to aid the allies both materially and morally, a treaty was resolved upon. A commission of thirty-eight Polish members was appointed to draw up its details in conference with

⁹ Cf. M. Horvath, VI, 117.

¹⁰ Letters of Buonvisi to the nuncio at Warsaw, December 14, and 21, 1682.

the ambassadors of the emperor. The sessions began on the 26th of February and closed on the last day of March, 1683. The conditions of the alliance were submitted to the diet where they were unanimously confirmed and afterwards signed also by the emperor. In the documents of the alliance,—to use our author's words,—“the powers of the confederation point to the fatherly zeal of Pope Innocent XI, who by means of effectual advice and magnanimous contributions had brought about the war with the Turks. The two rulers declared, also, that they would conclude an *offensive* as well as a *defensive* alliance, the latter lasting forever and the former till both powers could come to a lasting and a satisfactory agreement with the enemy. At the same time the pope was entreated to take charge of the protectorate for the preservation and surety of the alliance.”

It soon became evident that the rulers in forming this alliance, and the statesmen who helped to make it a success, had rendered a great service to their country and to all Christendom. On the very day when the documents were signed at Warsaw, 250,000 Turks, under the command of the grand vizier, Kara-Mustafa, set out from Adrianople for the capture of Vienna, an undertaking in which a century and a half before Suleiman the Great had failed.

The impending danger was realized too late at the imperial court. It was only in the latter part of spring that the imperial forces began to fortify themselves against the enemy. Here, too, Cardinal Buonvisi played an important part by his wise councils; he hastened help from all sides, and used it to the best advantage.¹¹

The Pope was true to his promises. The court of Vienna received from him 400,000 florins for the equipment of the

¹¹ Several accounts of the events of 1683, were published in 1883, on the occasion of the second centenary of the raising of the siege of Vienna. The best of them is by Onno Kloss: *Das Jahr 1683 und der folgende grosse Turkenkrieg* (Graz, 1883), p. 580, although we must note that he judges the situation of Hungary incorrectly and in some places unjustly. Some of the reports of Buonvisi have been edited by the scholarly members of the “Campo Santo dei Tedeschi” at Rome (1883).

army; he sent 500,000 to Sobieski and 300,000 to the elector of Bavaria. Many of the higher clergy, incited by the noble example of the great pope, showed a wonderful spirit of self-sacrifice. The garrison of Vienna, consisting of 12,000 soldiers under the command of Count Rüdiger von Stahrenberg, displayed a heroic resistance for six weeks. In the seventh week Sobieski at the head of 26,000 men arrived, and in company with Duke Charles of Lorraine won a decisive victory (September 12) over the Turks and liberated Vienna. It was a brilliant victory for Christendom, and the first result of the Austro-Polish alliance. "Whom are we to thank for this victory? It is difficult to say. Great events are not the work of single men, but the result of the co-operation of many."

The liberation of Vienna was but the first step towards the fulfillment of the pope's wish. The liberation of Hungary and the overthrow of the Ottoman power still remained. Elated over this first victory, Innocent urged unceasingly the continuation of the alliance, declaring that he was willing to make any sacrifice to bring it to a successful issue.

About this time the allied parties gained a notable increase of power through the accession of Venice; and this was owing to the initiative of the emperor. In the beginning of December, the imperial ambassador laid the noble task of the great alliance before the Signoria and invited the Republic to join it. The matter was taken up, and, after discussing the conditions, the senate voted in favor of joining the allied powers. The treaty was signed March 5, 1684, by the Venetian commission appointed for the purpose. The result of the step was hailed with joy by the pope as well as by the allies themselves. Leopold declared that it was now certain that the aim of the alliance, the complete liberation of Christendom from the tyrannical yoke of Turkey, would be attained. Innocent gladly blessed this triple alliance and called it the Holy League."¹² The allies made the Pope the protector of the

¹² The letters exchanged between the pope and the members of the League were edited by Theiner, 266-271. It is worthy of notice that the pope in his letter to Leopold, May 27, 1684, declared that the accession

League "in the sure hope that not a member of the League would regret to pay filial obedience to every fatherly summons of His Holiness."

The Holy League, however, could not immediately begin its operations, owing to the troubles that again arose between France and Austria. The feeling that existed between these two countries was as bitter as ever. Moreover, Louis XIV viewed with an envious eye the success that he knew Leopold would have in the war with Turkey, and put forth every effort to break up the triple alliance. Taking advantage of the preparations of the imperial forces for the expedition against the Turks, he laid siege to Luxemburg. When the news of this reached the emperor, his ministers advised him to order his forces to the Rhine. Cardinal Buonvisi, however, objected to this, saying that the army was being equipped to fight the infidels. But the ministers insisted that if the emperor did not interfere, he would endanger his imperial crown and sacrifice Germany and Italy to the French. The emperor seemed undecided for a while as to which course to follow; but four weeks later, when Louis XIV took Luxemburg, he determined, in spite of the remonstrance of Buonvisi, to send to the Rhine a part of the troops equipped at the pope's expense. Buonvisi was very much grieved. He saw all his hopes come to nought. He did not doubt but that if the emperor had united his army with that of the elector of Bavaria, they could have recaptured Buda and Pesth without much trouble. Now, however, he saw that all his labor and the sacrifices of Innocent XI had been in vain. The fears of Buonvisi were not unfounded. The efforts toward the war of liberation were on the point of a total failure when happily the hostile parties concluded the peace (August 15, 1684), known as that of Ratisbon.

Finally, then, the war could begin. The threatening attitude of Louis XIV and the hesitation of the imperial court as to whether or not war should be declared against France, delayed the expedition, and it was only toward the end of

of Venice to the League took place "*opera praecepue . . . Francisci Cardinalis Buonvisii.*" 270.

May that real activities began. General Leslie at the head of 10,000 men was sent to the river Drave to hinder any reinforcements from Turkey; while Generals Schultz and Francis Barkoci with 8,000 men were sent to northern Hungary to hold Tököli in check. The main army consisting of 35,000 men was placed under the command of Duke Charles of Lorraine. The opening of the campaign was auspicious. Duke Charles began his operations on the right bank of the Danube; July 13, he laid siege to Visegrád, the fall of which was followed by the surrender of Vázt and that of Pesth. The imperial forces were now joined by the palatine of Esterházy with 10,000 Hungarians, and they proceeded jointly to lay siege to Buda. In the meantime Duke Charles, having left Stahremberg, the heroic defender of Vienna, to bear the brunt of the siege, attacked Kara-Mustafa, whom he put to flight after a long and bloody struggle. These successes rendered him and his officers over-confident in their strength, and they permitted all kinds of disorder among the soldiers. They were persuaded that the Turks could not hold out longer than five days. Cardinal Buonvisi did not share their views. He sent a special courier to the elector of Bavaria, calling upon him to hasten to the assistance of the besiegers of Buda.¹³ But the arrival of the elector at the head of six thousand men, did not bring about the hoped-for result. Owing to the almost constant disagreement among the generals, the lack of discipline among the soldiers, and the heroic resistance of the Turkish garrison, the siege resulted in a failure; and at the end of October, after a loss of 20,000 men, it was raised.

When the pope was informed that the failure was due to the presumption and the negligence of the generals, he was somewhat discouraged and inclined to withhold further assistance. But he soon realized the awful calamities that would

¹³ Report of Buonvisi, August 13, 1684. Among other things he writes: "Rappresentai che tutto consisteva nella prestezza, e che sotto Buda si haveva di decidere la sorte della guerra, onde bisognava trascurare tutte 'altre considerazioni, ancorché importantissime, per condurre à fine quest' impresa."

befall the whole of Europe, were he to abandon his fatherly care of the Christian armies. His liberality, therefore, was by no means diminished, and he did all in his power to further the continuation of the war. Of his self-sacrifice and energy Fraknói writes: "The pope did not hesitate in the least to spend for military purposes a great part of the legacies left by the archbishop of Estergom and the bishop of Vienna. Later on, to meet the expenses of war, he ordered the sale of a third part of the landed estates, which the monastic houses of the hereditary imperial provinces had acquired during the past sixty years; the proceeds were sent to the imperial treasury. For the execution of this measure, Cardinal Buonvisi and Kallowich, bishop of Rabb, were appointed papal commissaries."¹⁴

At the same time the prince-bishops of the empire were summoned by the pope to place their soldiers at the service of the emperor, and without delay. Every nuncio was especially urged to induce the higher clergy to contribute generously themselves and to gather money for the support of the war. The pope granted an indulgence to all who could help either materially or morally to bring the campaign to a successful end.

The result of these summons was encouraging. At the end of March, 1685, the secretary of state informed Buonvisi of the compliance of the archbishop of Salzburg, and the bishops of Würzburg and Paderborn; furthermore, that the archbishop of Salzburg had given 75,000 florins, and gunpowder valued at 25,000 florins; the bishop of Trent, in conjunction with the clergy, offered 200,000 florins and the bishop of Brixen 16,000.¹⁵ In all parts of Europe collections were made, and the contributions were transmitted to Buonvisi to be used partly for military purposes and partly for the erection of hospitals.¹⁶

¹⁴ In the papal brief the bishop of Vienna was originally appointed as one of the commissaries; after his death the bishop of Gurk was invited to take his place, but he excused himself on account of his old age; then came the appointment of Kollowich.

¹⁵ Report of the Secretary of State, March 24, 1685.

¹⁶ Letters of Buonvisi, April 1, May 20, and July 1, 1685.

As soon as the pope had learned from Buonvisi's reports that the capture of Ujvár was of great importance, he sent for this purpose 100,000 florins in the beginning of April and a few months later, at the instance of the nuncio, another sum of 50,000 florins. For the armies of the governor of Croatia he sent 15,000 florins and for hospital purposes 10,000 florins, together with a great amount of balsam.¹⁷

By this liberality the Holy See rendered a service of the greatest moment, since the pitiable condition of the imperial treasury had much retarded the proper equipment of the army. This long standing evil Buonvisi often mentions in his reports. He traces it to two sources—corrupt administration and the pomp of the court.

The nuncio was repeatedly called upon by Rome to exhort the emperor and the nobility to economy and to the maintenance of a stricter discipline. He was advised to induce the emperor to exile or at least, for the sake of example, to remove from office some of the more corrupt nobles.¹⁸ Buonvisi endeavored to obey the pope's command to the letter, but all was in vain. "The interests of so many are affected," he said, "that they give no heed to my words."¹⁹

The campaign of 1685 opened in July with the siege of Ujvár, which Charles of Lorraine surrounded with an army of 40,000 men. While the imperial army was engaged in this siege, Pasha Ibrahim marched from Buda at the head of 40,000 Turks against Visegrád, which he captured after a few days, and proceeded to besiege Esztergom. Charles of Lorraine, however, took half of his besieging army from beneath the walls of Ujvár and hastened to the rescue of Esztergom. At his approach the Pasha raised the siege and prepared for an engagement. The battle was fought August 16, near Nyerges-Ujfalú, and the imperial army won a signal victory. Three days later, General Caprara, with the other half of the army,

¹⁷ Note of the Secretary of State, April 7, 1685. Reports of Buonvisi, May 20, June 17, 24, and August 5, 1685.

¹⁸ Secret Note of the Secretary of State, March 4, 1684.

¹⁹ Report of Buonvisi, April 26, 1685.

captured Ujvár. This double victory was due mainly to the generous assistance of the pope. "The emperor's army owes its stability entirely to Your Holiness,"²⁰ writes Buonvisi. At the court of Vienna all were convinced that without the aid of Innocent XI it would have been utterly impossible to lay siege to Ujvár.

In this campaign as well as in that of the previous year (1684), Innocent XI provided not only for the thorough equipment of the army, but also for the sick and the wounded soldiers. In the last decades of the seventeenth century the sanitary condition of the military camps was sadly neglected. The officers of the army did not consider it their duty to look after the sick and the wounded; the result was that the latter were often left without any assistance whatever. The pope knew this too well; consequently he had a number of hospitals erected, which he provided with physicians and surgeons.²¹ We learn of the work done in these hospitals from the letters of Buonvisi to Rome. He takes pleasure in announcing to the pope that the sick are receiving excellent care, and that many of the sick Protestants, moved by the charity of the Holy Father, have returned to the Church.²² The generals themselves announced that in the campaign of this year alone the lives of over 4,000 soldiers were saved in these hospitals.²³

About this time an attempt was made on the part of the pasha of Buda to restore peace between the Osmanli and Austria. He sent a letter to the secretary of war stating that the sultan was now willing to conclude a treaty of peace with the emperor, if the latter so desired, but on reasonable conditions. This step filled Buonvisi with consternation; he feared that the emperor would not refuse the offer, and that he would excuse his action by saying, as he did at the Peace of Nimwegen, that "he must conclude peace, since his generals

²⁰ Report of Buonvisi, August 26, 1685.

²¹ Letter of Contarini, Venetian ambassador at Vienna, December 26, 1683.

²² Report of Buonvisi, September 9, 1685.

²³ Report of Buonvisi, November 29, 1685.

were no longer fit to lead the campaigns." Buonvisi emphatically opposed all propositions of peace and strongly recommended the continuation of the war.²⁴ His representations, however, were seriously weakened by the reports from the Austrian ambassador at Rome.

Immediately after the victories of Ujvár and Nyerges-Ujfalú, the Emperor sent young Count Rosenberg to Rome to inform the pope of these events and to ask for fresh succor. Cardinal Pio, on introducing the ambassador to the Pope, explained, that "the emperor imputed the victories of the Christian armies in the first place to the help of His Holiness," and that he begged his further assistance in order to continue the war. The pope declared himself willing to satisfy the demands for moral support by calling on the neighboring nations for assistance and by rousing Sobieski from his lethargy by reminding him of the obligations that he had taken upon himself in joining the Holy League, as for material support he emphasized the fact that the condition of the pontifical treasury put an end temporarily to his generosity.

This unfavorable decision was caused by the suspicious attitude of the imperial court toward the Holy See. At Vienna, however, the answer given to Count Rosenberg and the letters of Cardinal Pio were interpreted to mean that the Pope desired peace. It was not so, however. Innocent XI had no thought whatever of concluding a treaty with the infidels, for simultaneously with this answer to the court of Vienna, the nuncio received orders to induce the emperor and his ministers to reject all Turkish conditions of peace and to continue the war, in which policy Buonvisi finally succeeded. The emperor assured him that the court had no thought of discontinuing the war, and in order to completely satisfy the Nuncio, he requested him to prepare the answer which the secretary of war should send to the pasha of Buda.

While Innocent XI worked with renewed fervor for the success of the Christian cause, the situation took on a new aspect.

²⁴ Report of Buonvisi, September 23, 1685.

Early in October, the rebel leader, Tököli, then the ally of the Turks, was arrested and cast into chains at the command of the grand vizier, whereupon many of his followers left him and sought the imperial pardon. The city of Kassa, which Caprara was besieging, opened its gates to the imperial army. The pope was deeply moved by this news, and considered it a sure sign that the Turkish power in Europe was beginning to totter.

At the request of Cardinal Pio, Innocent XI now imposed a tax on the Spanish clergy for the benefit of the war.²⁵ He promulgated anew the Bull of Indulgences of St. Pius V, and promised that as soon as the condition of the papal treasury would permit, he would make new sacrifices for the sacred cause.

During the summer of 1685, Sobieski remained inactive. The promises, that he had repeatedly made to the other members of the League were never fulfilled, although the pope continually sent him large sums of money.²⁶ He spent his time in planning campaigns.²⁷ In the end Cardinal Buonvisi grew impatient at the long inactivity of the Polish king and declared to the nuncio at Warsaw, "that it would be far more desirable if the King of Poland would plan less and do more."²⁸ Sobieski, however, had no thought of aiding Leopold. On the contrary, he sent Duke Lubomirski to Vienna to ask for a division of the imperial army to help him in his projected siege of the fortress of Kamenits. Both the emperor and the pope were pleased with this enterprise and Innocent XI sent him

²⁵ All holders of benefices were obliged to deliver up, once for all, a sixteenth part of their annual revenues.

²⁶ Thus on July 16, 1685, Innocent XI sent him 75,086 dollars.

²⁷ For example, in the beginning of summer, thinking that the campaign would be carried on in the vicinity of the river Theiss, he wished to lead his army thither. He therefore requested Cardinal Buonvisi to obtain the approbation of the court of Vienna. Buonvisi did not even set the case before the ministers, knowing well that it would never be accepted. He advised the Polish king to march against the Tartars and hold them in check, also to send three or four thousand horsemen to Hungary, where they might be needed. (Report of Buonvisi, July 22, 1685, and his letters to the Nuncio of Warsaw, September 10.)

²⁸ Reports of Buonvisi, October 21, 1685.

at once a million florins to cover his military expenses. The imperial court, however, was not pleased with Sobieski's request. They suspected that he hoped to meet with a refusal, which would have served as an excuse to quit the Holy League and to conclude a treaty with Louis XIV with whom he was in constant correspondence.

At the end of the year 1685, the great pope, who was, properly speaking, the soul and the main compelling force of the war, grew ill.²⁹ Doubtless, if Divine Providence had not renewed his vigor, the Turks would have remained for centuries the plague of Europe.

It was now time that the imperial court should begin preparations for the campaigns of the coming spring and summer. The usual obstacle, however, was the lack of money for military purposes. We can easily calculate what success the European powers would have had in this war, if the papal generosity had been withdrawn. While the Spanish clergy were reluctant and slow in complying with the papal levy on their revenues, two well-known ecclesiastics of Switzerland voluntarily sacrificed considerable sums. The bishop of Basel sent 12,000 florins and the abbot of Saint-Gall 6,000 florins;³⁰ the Benedictines and Cistercian abbeys together offered 2,200 florins.³¹ A large sum of money was also collected in Austria from the religious orders of the inheritable provinces. About the middle of February, Buonvisi informed Innocent XI that so far he had collected 826,000 florins which he had placed at the disposal of the Emperor, in the near future he hoped to have 50,000 florins more, but even this provision was not enough for the army. The pope, however, as he had again and again declared, could not make new sacrifices.³² These declarations had an almost overwhelming effect on Emperor Leopold. He admitted, says Fraknói, that "there never was a pope, who had done so much good for the common-weal as

²⁹ Gérin, *Recherches historiques*, p. 358; Klopp, p. 399.

³⁰ Report of Buonvisi, February 10, 1686.

³¹ Report of Buonvisi, November 4, 1685.

³² Note of the Secretary of State, February 16, 1686.

Innocent XI. To him thanks are due that up till now it has been possible to safeguard Christendom." He declared, however, that the half-million florins received from Rome, as well as the taxes levied upon all the religious orders, had already been used up, and he begged for the further assistance and support of the pope in order to carry on the war with unabated energy. Innocent XI declared anew that, owing to the exhausted condition of the papal treasury, he was unable to make further sacrifices.

As a matter of fact Innocent XI merely wished to induce the imperial court to a stricter economy. In the meantime he sent to Sobieski, of whom he expected great things, at first 100,000 florins, and later on 500,000. The court of Vienna seemed displeased at this generosity of the pope, and were quite put out over the fact that Innocent denied help to the Emperor and had been so liberal to Sobieski, who, they firmly believed, would never realize the plans for which he was receiving such generous support. Cardinal Buonvisi frankly expressed his opinion in a confidential letter to the nuncio of Warsaw. He seems surprised that the rich king of Poland refuses to use "a single farthing" of his own treasury for a war on which depends the safety of his country. And while the emperor repays the pope's liberality with gratitude and by his brilliant victories over the Turks, Sobieski, though as well supported by Rome as Leopold, can show no result whatever of the many sacrifices made for him by the pope. There is great fear, he concludes, that the Polish king is merely seeking an excuse to quit the Holy League.³³

About the middle of May a powerful army of 80,000 men stood ready. The German and Hungarian forces of Leopold were joined by the army of the elector of Bavaria, and by the troops of a number of other princes, civil and ecclesiastical.

When Innocent XI saw that the imperial court was earnestly engaged in the equipment of strong places, and had already begun the campaign, he transmitted to the emperor by the hands of the nuncio, a sum of 100,000 florins and promised

³³ Letter of Buonvisi, December 23, 1686, to the Nuncio of Warsaw.

further support. The operations of the Christian armies were attended with good fortune. On the 18th of June the allied forces, under the command of Charles of Lorraine and Max of Bavaria, arrived beneath the walls of Buda, defended by Pasha Albi, with a garrison of 15,000 men. The siege was begun at once.

As in previous years, the nuncio again proved himself extremely thoughtful in erecting military hospitals for the care of the wounded. The 45,000 florins sent by the pope and the considerable amount of balsam received from Italy, were used with good results. Over 6,000 soldiers owed their lives to the care they received in these hospitals.

The siege of Buda proceeded slowly. On July 13, Duke Charles ordered an assault, but was repulsed leaving behind him 1,500 dead. On July 22, after one of the great powder magazines of the fort had been blown up, another assault was made, but without result. The Christian generals were somewhat discouraged at this, but the nuncio spurred them on to continue the siege. The grand vizier, in the meantime, at the head of an immense army, was approaching, and arrived before Buda, August 12. His plan was not to attack the imperial forces openly, but merely to harass them in such a way that they would be forced to retreat. The imperial generals, however, were too wary for him. Charles of Lorraine suspected the grand vizier's plan, and he ordered one division of his army to hold the Turks in check while his main forces continued the siege. The defenders of Buda again and again signalled to the grand vizier, that unless help came they could hold the fort no longer. Suleiman, however, could do nothing. He was forced to undergo the agony of seeing his Turkish comrades and their stronghold captured under his very eyes without being able to help them. On the last day of August, Duke Charles assembled his officers and held a council of war, wherein it was decided that they would make a general assault on the second of September. The weakened garrison fought desperately. About four o'clock in the afternoon the assault was begun, and after a bloody fight of two hours, the

Christians were masters of Buda. The capital of Hungary, considered by the Turks as the key to Europe, was free from the yoke under which it had groaned for over one hundred and fifty years. During the siege news of another great Christian victory arrived. The naval squadron of Venice, under the command of Admiral Morosini, with the assistance of the papal fleet, had won the glorious victory of Navarino, completely routing 10,000 Turks.³⁴

The taking of Buda filled with joy the heart of Innocent XI. He immediately ordered a solemn act of thanksgiving to be made to the Most High for the great blessing just bestowed upon Christianity. The Pope, moreover, sent letters to the victorious generals in which he expresses his heartfelt thanks for the labors they had endured to bring the siege to a successful issue.³⁵ Throughout the whole of Europe all true Christian hearts were moved to joy and thanksgiving. Those who had taken part in the great event, especially such men as Buonvisi, the enthusiastic and untiring nuncio at Vienna, and Emperor Leopold I, were recipients of boundless gratitude. "Thankful for the liberation of Buda, the Hungarian nation refused to make use of its right to freely choose its king, and at the Diet the male heir of the House of Hapsburg was named." But it was Pope Innocent XI who received general acknowledgment. James II, King of England, expressed himself as follows: "His Holiness has delivered the city of Vienna; he has laid siege to Buda. For centuries no such pope has occupied the Chair of Peter."

After the victory of Buda the Sultan made another offer of peace. The matter was taken up and considered. But Belgrade and many other strongholds still remained in the power of the Turks. Most of the pope's desires were indeed realized, but not all, consequently the time for peace had not yet arrived. The pope was no less liberal now than before. He sent to

³⁴ Letter of the Venetian Doge, July 1, 1686, to Innocent XI; Theiner, p. 307.

³⁵ His letter to Leopold I, to the Elector of Bavaria, and to the Duke of Lorraine, date from September 22, 27, and October 26.

Vienna sums that altogether amounted to more than 600,000 florins, which enabled the war to be carried on with much success. After the taking of Buda, Suleiman, the grand vizier, at the head of his 60,000 Turks, turned in pursuit of Duke Charles of Lorraine, who had 50,000 men under his command. The Duke retreated as far as the plains of Mohács, where he prepared for battle. The engagement took place August 12. It was a hard fought battle, but ended in the almost complete annihilation of the Turkish army. After this the allied forces had but little difficulty in taking the other strongholds. One by one all the districts occupied by the infidels were freed from Turkish tyranny, till finally, September 6, 1688, Belgrade, after a siege of four weeks, fell into the hands of the victorious Christians.

The great and noble work was ended. Pope Innocent XI did not long survive the conclusion of the war of liberation. His mission on earth was fulfilled, and after a short illness, he died August 12, 1689.

The power of Islam over Christendom was at last destroyed. To this excellent and zealous pope, who liberated Hungary and did so much, not only for the Hapsburg dynasty, but also for all Christendom threatened by the Osmanli, the Hungarians have raised a fitting monument, and even to this day they hold his name in benediction. Out of gratitude to him, the pope's nephew, Livio Odescalchi, was made Duke of Sirmium, and in 1751, the Hungarian Assembly conferred on the latter's son the rights of citizenship. The Odescalchi are still an influential family of Hungary, and as such possess a title of nobility second to none in Europe.

It is difficult to realize the full value of the service rendered by Innocent XI to Hungary, unless one understands the condition of the country in the seventeenth century and the feeling that pervaded the people immediately before the liberation. The following passages from an excellent work of Acsády, a distinguished Hungarian historian, will enable us to appreciate the situation. They give at least a faint idea of the dangers from which Pope Innocent XI saved Europe, and the miseries

from which he delivered the Hungarian nation. This historian begins the preface to his *Hungary at the Reconquest of Buda*, with the following words: "The reconquest of Buda and the liberation of Hungary from the yoke of the Turks are epoch-making events in the national history of Hungary, whereby the dreams of generations, the wailing of millions, the ideals of the noblest hearts were realized. To repel and break the Osmanli power was for a hundred and seventy years the end and purpose of Hungarian policy. This great end was bequeathed as a sacred legacy from one generation to another, every child of Hungary taking to the grave the hope that the next generation would have better fortune and behold the glad day of freedom.

He concludes with the following passage: "Concerning the defeat at Mohács (1526) the Hungarians do not speak of it as a lost battle but as a catastrophe. With this disastrous day indeed a catastrophe fell upon Hungary. Then began an epoch, when famine and misery increased as decade after decade rolled by. While the land was under the degrading influence of Turkish rule, it steadily approached destruction. From generation to generation the Hungarian people diminished in number, in wealth, as in political standing and culture. The yoke of a hundred and seventy years and its many concomitant evils had finally brought the state to the very edge of destruction. Often has it been maintained that never since the great invasion of the Tartars had the land been in a more desperate condition, than immediately before the liberation.

.

"The story of the seventeenth century is a dark and sanguinary page in the annals of every nation in Europe. Flourishing states and mighty peoples succumbed. Cruel and devastating wars raged everywhere. . . . External enemies combined with domestic confusion to destroy human culture. There is nothing, as a German writer has said, in the history of this century, that made the hearts beat faster, which satisfied the people more, than that series of glorious victories, by which the chains of Turkish slavery were burst and the liberation of

Hungary completed, by which Europe was forever delivered from the dangers of Mohammedan conquests and domination. The news of these victories, by which the holiest ideals of the Hungarian people were realized, electrified even the most distant peoples.

“To break the Turkish yoke had been for more than a century and a half, amid much turbulences and compulsory submission, the ideal of the best citizens. Finally the ideal was realized, and at a period when the ruin of Hungary was about completed. At the last moment the favorable turn long desired, but scarcely hoped for, set in. Ten years later it would perhaps have been too late; the Hungarian element would have dwindled to such a degree, that it could no longer have claimed on its own soil political and spiritual supremacy. Fortunately, however, the Almighty restored to the Hungarians their capital and their country, for the most part, it is true, in a chaotic and disordered condition; nevertheless He restored it. An age of peace now dawned to which was reserved the second peopling of the wilderness, the creation of a new thrift and a new Magyar life.”

GEORGE F. HORWARTH, C. S.C.

HOLY CROSS COLLEGE.
CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY.

NOTES ON EDUCATION.

THE TEACHING OF RELIGION.

One aspect of the work of outlining a method of teaching Religion resolves itself into an attempt to bring the teaching of Religion into conformity with the fundamental principles of education which have been firmly established through the advance of pedagogical science. These principles derive their validity from their conformity to the laws governing the unfolding and the normal functioning of the mind and hence they apply with equal force to all the subjects which find place in the curriculum. There can be no question that in our schools Religion should be the very first subject to benefit by every advance in our knowledge of fundamental principles. That it has not done so will be readily admitted, nor will we have far to seek for the reasons of this ultra-conservatism in the methods employed in the teaching of Christian Doctrine. The content here is so sacred to the Catholic conscience and it is frequently so far beyond the reach of the unaided efforts of human reason that great care is naturally exercised in making even the slightest change of method.

Moreover, those to whom the Church entrusts the all-important work of teaching the religion of Jesus Christ to her children very rightly believe that their Divine Master understood the capacity of the human mind and the nature of the doctrines which He taught better than the modern pedagogue, however broad his scientific attainments. But it is not as generally known as it should be that every secure advance of modern pedagogy registers a closer approximation to Our Lord's method of teaching and to the method embodied by the Holy Ghost in the organic activities of the Church. It is a truism that there can be no conflict between faith and science, but the fact that the very methods employed by Christ and His Church are

the goal towards which scientific achievement is tending is only just beginning to come home to us.

We are beginning to have a clearer comprehension of the functions of memory and in proportion as we conform to this knowledge we are relieving the memory of needless burdens thus enabling it to minister more effectively to the needs of the growing mind. In like manner in proportion as we understand the meaning of mental assimilation we are refusing to rest content with mere knowledge and we are demanding that each truth gained be allowed to mould character and express itself in conduct. Genetic psychology has made it plain that the child is not a diminutive man but a being that will develop into manhood, preserving unity in his conscious life while undergoing a series of metamorphoses in the modes of his mental activity. Thus we have learned that we must begin with the child's instincts and by presenting truth in concrete form, gradually develop his intellect until he is capable of comprehending truth in its abstract formulation. The sequence in which the various truths shall be presented must be determined, in like manner, both by the series of developmental changes taking place in the child's consciousness and by the relationship of truth to truth as we ascend from the concrete to the abstract. The important rôle which feeling plays in the assimilation of truth throughout life, but particularly in early childhood, and the necessity of truth expressing itself in action as an indispensable step in the process of rendering it functional in the mind have been emphasized in recent psychological work. The all-important rôle of imitation and the necessity of correlation are to-day admitted among the fundamental principles of pedagogy. It is a joy to the Christian teacher to know that these principles find their fullest illustration and most perfect embodiment in Our Lord's method of teaching Religion and in the organic life of the Church.

OUR LORD'S METHOD OF TEACHING RELIGION.

In Our Lord's method of teaching Religion there may readily be distinguished three essential elements: 1) The doctrine or

dogmatic content of His teaching. This has been developed and systematized in Dogmatic Theology and many of its leading features have been defined by the infallible teaching Church. 2) His Divine Personality and the compelling force of the example set by the life which He lived among men. This element has been formulated in Moral Theology; it has been emphasized by the ascetic and accepted with loving gratitude by the devout Christian in every walk of life. Something of the force of this element in Our Lord's teaching shines forth in the lives of the saints. It continues to reach the children in our schools in a tangible way through the religious character of our teachers, through the beauty of the Christian virtues which adorn their lives and through their zeal for the salvation of souls which has led them to forsake the world and its allurements in order to bring to the little ones the saving truths of religion and to fill their lives with the knowledge and love of Jesus Christ. 3) The principles which underlie His method of teaching the sublime truths of religion to His simple and untutored followers. These principles stand out in bold relief on the pages of the Gospel. They have been embodied in the organic activity of the Church, in her Liturgy and in her Sacramental System, but they seem to have been lost sight of in the prevalent methods of teaching Christian Doctrine.

Our Lord sowed in the hearts of His followers the seeds of those mighty truths that were to reform the world and change the whole course of human events and He established a living Church which was to continue even to the consummation of the world to teach these truths to all nations and to unfold and define them according to the needs and capacities of the children of men.

A familiarity with Our Lord's method and a mastery of the principles on which it is based should be numbered among the qualifications of all who aspire to take their place beside Our Lord and to say with Him "Suffer the little children to come unto me and forbid them not for of such is the kingdom of Heaven." Nor is it unreasonable to expect of those who would aid the teacher in this sublime work by preparing textbooks to be placed in the hands of the children that they should

keep Our Lord's method constantly in view and be governed throughout their work by the principles upon which it is based. Teacher and text-book alike should adhere faithfully to the doctrines preached by Christ as expounded and defined by the Church. In order to render these truths fruitful, the principles that underlie Our Lord's method of teaching and that are embodied in the organic life of the Church should be faithfully adhered to.

If the circumstances and environment in which Our Lord taught be compared with those in which our teachers are called upon to teach the truths of religion many striking differences will be found which must be taken into account, but they do not justify a difference in the doctrines to be taught nor in the principles of the method to be employed. Our Lord's followers were for the most part adults, while our teachers are called upon to instruct little children. He spoke to an Oriental people, living in primitive conditions; the children of our schools do not live close to nature, they are for the most part the creatures of a complex civilization in which undue emphasis is laid on the products of human activity. But all the deeper elements in human nature remain the same in spite of the many changes in the environmental influences which are constantly impressing themselves upon human consciousness and modifying the details of human development, and it is precisely with these deeper elements that religion is concerned.

The multitudes that followed Our Lord over the hills of Judea and around the shores of the lake of Gennesaret consisted chiefly of the simple untutored children of Israel. They were fishermen, tillers of the soil and shepherds; they were servants, with here and there a master who had been led through curiosity to listen to the words of this new Prophet. There were traders, a few tax gatherers and an occasional lawyer who came to try conclusions with this Teacher who, by the magnetism of His personality, the sublimity of His doctrine, and His power over disease, was drawing the multitudes after Him. The deaf and the dumb, the lame, the halt and the blind, the palsied and the possessed, the leper and the poor—they were all there to be healed in mind and body and to witness

the wonderful works of God. They all lived close to nature and were the daily observers of her recurring phenomena; they all felt the throb of those elemental human emotions and passions which do not vary with shifting political boundaries nor change throughout the lapsing centuries; they all heard the voices of Moses and the Prophets and built their hope of redemption on the promised Messiah.

To this motley crowd Our Lord delivered the sublime truths of the spiritual kingdom, and He taught them, not as truths to be accepted in set phrases and stored in the memory, but as the bread of life that was to enter into the depths of their being and transform all their thinking and all their acting. "Be ye not hearers of the word only, but doers." "Not he that sayeth to me Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he that doth the will of my Father who is in heaven." The obligation to understand the lessons which He taught and to render them fruitful in their amended lives Our Lord illustrated by such parables as that of the talents and of the barren fig tree. And when the multitude were unable to understand Him, as is recorded in the sixth Chapter of St. John, Jesus said to them, "Murmur not among yourselves. No man can come to me except the Father who hath sent me draw him." And after this declaration to them of the necessity of a gift of faith in order to accept the truth which He was imparting to them, He proceeded to restate His doctrine again and again so as to leave them no subterfuge and no possibility of misunderstanding the nature of the difficult truths which they were called upon to believe. It is evident on every page of the Gospel that Our Lord not only delivered the truths of the Kingdom of Heaven to His followers, but that He sought in every way to make these truths take root in their intelligence and bear fruit in their conduct. He warned them in a hundred ways that they would be held accountable for every truth which they heard from His lips and that if they failed to grasp the meaning of these truths and to render them fruitful in their lives they would be condemned like the wicked servant who wrapped up his one talent in a napkin or like the barren fig tree that was to be cut down and cast into the fire. Over and

over again He cautioned them that "the letter killeth," and that it is "the spirit that giveth life."

It is evident, therefore, that those teachers of religion who would follow in Our Lord's footsteps must not rest content with securing verbal memory products but must strive unceasingly to render the sublime truths which they teach intelligible to their pupils and functional in their lives. To do this they should use every human means within their reach and above all they should consider carefully the means employed by Our Lord for the attainment of these ends. It is not recorded that Our Lord ever formulated His doctrines or that He set them forth in exact words which He required His followers either to write down or to memorize, but it is recorded of Him in the thirteenth chapter of the Gospel according to St. Matthew that "All these things Jesus spoke in parables to the multitude: and without parables He did not speak to them." He never presented a truth of the spiritual kingdom to His disciples without first preparing their minds for its reception by calling up familiar scenes and relating them to familiar human experiences.

The first preparation which Our Lord seems to have made on every occasion was to fill the souls of His followers with feelings of love and gratitude and wonder. He turned water into wine at the marriage feast; He fed the hungry; He cured the lame, the halt and the blind; He called the dead to life, and He preached the glad tidings to the poor and to the outcasts of Judea. When their minds were filled with wonder and their hearts overflowing with gratitude, they gave glory to God because a great Prophet was raised up amongst them. With their minds and hearts thus prepared, Jesus proceeded to unfold to them the truths of the kingdom of heaven. And the first thing He taught them was to look upon God as a most dear Father and to serve Him in a spirit of love and loyalty. He taught them to ask of Him all they stood in need of and to offer Him the tribute of their praise. Thus shall you pray: "Our Father who art in Heaven." To enable them to understand the sublime truth that God was their Father, He called their attention to the most familiar spectacles in nature. "Consider the lilies of the field how they grow; they toil not,

neither do they spin. But I say to you that not even Solomon in all his glory was arrayed as one of these. And if the grass of the field, which is to-day, and to-morrow is cast into the oven, God doth so clothe; how much more you, O ye of little faith? Be not solicitous, therefore, saying, what shall we eat: or what shall we drink, or wherewith shall we be clothed? For after all these things do the heathens seek. For your Father knoweth you have need of all these things. Seek ye, therefore, first the kingdom of God and His justice and all these things shall be added unto you." (*Matt.* vi, 28-34).

He recurs to this lesson again and again throughout the whole of His public career as if He would make sure of this at least that His followers would understand something of the Father's love for them and of His solicitous care for their well-being. In this conviction and in the feelings and emotions which it would naturally produce in their hearts He seemed to rest His hope of their understanding the truths of the spiritual kingdom and of their conforming their conduct to its laws. In most of Our Lord's lessons, as in the one which we have just cited, there may be discerned four phases. In the first of these Our Lord appeals to His hearers' observation of familiar phenomena in the vegetable and animal worlds. In the second phase He appeals to human feelings and emotions, to the various circumstances of the every-day struggle for existence. This phase is always present even when the first phase is omitted. In the third phase of His lessons He leads His followers to contemplate the exalted state of the children of the kingdom as seen in comparison with the dwellers on the lower planes of life. And finally He points out the obligation that rests upon the children of the kingdom to bring their conduct into conformity with their high estate as children of God.

He invariably drew His analogies from those natural phenomena which were most familiar to His hearers: the birds of the air, the budding fig tree, the vine and its branches, the seed falling by the wayside, on stony ground or in good soil and the weeds which sometimes choke it, the hairs on their heads, the cockle and the tares. From these things He turned to the rich store of elemental human emotions, such as the

shepherd's love for his sheep and their answering recognition of his voice, the father's love for his children, "And which of you if your son shall ask him for bread will you reach him a stone?" and the father's quick forgiveness of the repentant prodigal, the envy of the hireling, the anger of the king whose invitation was slighted, the servant who, though forgiven, refused to forgive his fellow servant. He called attention to the wisdom of the collector of jewels who, having found the one pearl of great price, sold all that he possessed in order to purchase it. He reminded them of the joy of the woman who found her groat and of the shepherd who found the straying member of his fold. He commended the worldly wisdom of the unjust steward and warned His followers against the wickedness of the servant who wrapped up his one talent in a napkin and against the foolish virgins who put off their preparation to the last moment. Out of such simple materials, drawn from the most familiar experiences of His hearers, Our Lord fashioned the concrete setting of His lessons and built His parables through which He led His followers into an understanding of the spiritual truths by which they were to be regenerated. He always proceeded thus from the known to the unknown; from the tangible and the concrete to the abstract and the spiritual; from the natural to the supernatural.

Our Lord frequently had recourse to striking object lessons, as when He cursed the barren fig tree and caused it to wither away and when He called attention to the fact that the one leper who returned to give thanks was a stranger and that the faith of the Centurion was greater than any He had found in Israel. Similarly, He made use of His miracles to drive home vital truths, as when, coming down to the shores of the lake, He found the fisherman washing their nets and ordered them to push out and let down their nets for a draught; and when they were astonished at the multitude of fishes enclosed, He told them to leave their nets for henceforth they were to be fishers of men. He multiplied the loaves and the fishes to feed the hungry multitude and when they found Him on the other side of the lake, He made use of this miracle to place before them the truth of the Blessed Sacrament which He was

about to establish. "Amen, amen I say to you, you seek me not because you have seen miracles, but because you did eat of the loaves and were filled. Labor not for the meat which perisheth but for that which endureth unto life everlasting, which the Son of man will give you. . . . Our fathers did eat manna in the desert, as it is written; He gave them bread from heaven to eat. Then Jesus said to them: "Amen, amen I say to you; Moses gave you not bread from heaven, but my Father giveth you the true bread from heaven. For the bread of God is that which cometh down from heaven and giveth life to the world." Then Our Lord proceeded to unfold to them the mystery of the Holy Eucharist, having combined in His preparation the striking and sensible fact of His miracle and the earlier figure of the same truth, the manna in the desert, the knowledge of which was preserved for them in their Scriptures. Our Lord appealed not only to the experience of His individual hearers, but to the experience of their race. He pointed out the action of Divine Providence in their own lives, in the phenomena of surrounding nature, and in the history of their race. He called upon the natural feelings and emotions and upon the religious truths and emotions that had grown into their lives and the lives of their people. He found them possessed of a knowledge of the letter of the sacred Scriptures but without a comprehension of their spirit or their larger meanings, and He unceasingly warned them against their narrow and rigid interpretations. He warned them against the letter of the law that killeth and showed them that it was the spirit that giveth life. To bring home to them the spirit and meaning of the truths which were wrapped up in the statements of the Prophets, He constantly employed the concrete and tangible happenings of daily life. And in this way He gradually led them into an understanding of those sublime spiritual truths which He came from heaven to teach to the children of men and which, in fact He taught so effectively that His lessons in time transformed the world and built up the institutions of Christian civilization. But He did not expect the harvest on the day of its planting. "Unless the grain of corn falling

into the earth perish, itself remaineth alone, but if it perish it bringeth forth much fruit."

The Apostles followed in their Master's footsteps. They continued to teach His doctrines and they taught by His method. This is sufficiently indicated in the first verses of the Gospel according to St. Luke. "For as much as many have taken in hand to set forth in order a narration of the things that have been accomplished among us; according as they have delivered them to us, who from the beginning were eye witnesses and ministers of the word: it seemed good to me also, having diligently attained to all things from the beginning, to write to thee in order, most excellent Theophilus, that thou mayest know the verity of those words in which thou hast been instructed." The Apostles instructed the first Christians in the truths of the spiritual kingdom; they made converts among the Jews and the Gentiles, among the learned and the untutored; they lit the torch of faith in the heart of the self-indulgent Roman and they softened the rigor of the religious fanatic, and thus they built up the foundations of the Christian Church.

The deposit of Revealed Truth was carefully guarded by the early Christian teachers. Little by little the fundamental truths of Christianity emerged in clear definitions, as may be seen in the Apostles' Creed and in the Athanasian and Nicene Creeds. The Sacred Scriptures and the commentaries by the Fathers kept the teaching of Christ in the hearts of the people. These prolific writings were in time summarized in convenient formularies. The catechism of the Council of Trent forms a striking example of a brief, clear resumé of the doctrines of Christianity. But all down the ages it was the Sacramental system of the Church and her Liturgy that kept the vital truths of Christianity vividly before the minds of the people and that rendered them fruitful in their lives. To the Liturgy, as a means of popular instruction, were added in time the resources of the fine arts. Poetry and music lent their beauty and eloquence, while painting, sculpture and architecture joined in the building of great cathedrals which spoke eloquently to the hearts and minds of the unlettered children of the forest no less than to the cultivated mind of the philosopher and of

the theologian. All this has frequently been pointed out by students of Medieval history, but few non-Catholic writers have exhibited so keen an appreciation of this side of the Church's work as Charles Eliot Norton, the well-known Dante scholar of Harvard University. "But it was in the great church edifice that many parts were united, as in no other work, in a single joint and indivisible product of their highest energies. From the pavement rich with mosaic of tile or marble; or inlaid with the sepulchral slabs of those who in life had knelt upon it, up to the cross that gleamed on the airy summit of the central spire, each separate feature, instinct with the life of art, contributed to the organic unity of the consummate master-piece of creative imagination. Religious enthusiasm, patriotic pride, the strongest sentiments of the community, the deepest feelings of each individual, found here their most poetic expression. The Church was not merely picturesque, but pictorial. The system of mosaic decoration, with which arches, vaults, and domes were covered, was intended not merely for ornament, but as a series of pictures of religious instruction. The Scriptures were here displayed in imperishable painting before the eyes of those who could not read the written word. The Church became thus not only the sanctuary wherein to pray, to confess, to be absolved, but also a school-house for the teaching of the faithful. The scheme of its pictorial decoration includes the story of the race of man, his fall and redemption; the life and passion of the Saviour, and the works of His Apostles and saints."

The teacher of religion who would be faithful to the Divine Model, must take into account natural phenomena, human emotions and passions, the figures and prophecies of the Old Testament and their fulfillment in the New. He must seek to make the Saviour live in the imagination and in the heart and he must call to his assistance every resource of art. This plan will be carried out as far as may be in the series of text-books of Religion which are here under discussion.

CURRENT CRITICISMS OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

While looking for causes and remedies for the failures of our public school education it may be just as well to make it clear once for all that after the banishing of religion from our schools the greatest calamity that has befallen them is the substitution of the hireling teacher for the vocational teacher. Teaching is essentially a delegated parental function and it can no more become an economic function than can the bringing of children into the world. The teacher who attempts to fulfill the duties of his lofty vocation merely for the salary that he is to draw never knows what real teaching is and the children under his care are in a way as unfortunate as those others who instead of parents have known only the boardinghouse mistress or the hired superintendent of official charity. Our Lord left no room for doubt as to His position on this subject: "You cannot serve God and mammon," "I am the good shepherd. The good shepherd giveth his life for his sheep. But the hireling, and he that is not the shepherd, whose own the sheep are not, seeth the wolf coming, and leaveth the sheep, and flyeth: and the wolf catcheth and scattereth the sheep: and the hireling flyeth because he is a hireling: and he hath no care for the sheep. I am the good shepherd; and I know mine and mine know me. As the Father knoweth me and I know the Father: and I lay down my life for my sheep." (*John* x, 11-15.) The relation of father and child is here held up as the only relation that should be permitted between the teacher and his pupils. It is this relationship that Our Lord clothes in the parable of the sheep and the shepherd. Teaching was at times an economic function among pagan nations and the masses of the people groaned in slavery, while only the few enjoyed the blessings of culture and of freedom. The Christian Church educated Europe and built up its civilization, but in the doing of this work she relied on those of her children who were called to the vocation of teaching even as Aaron was called to the priesthood.

In assigning his reasons for omitting the statistics for the Roman Catholic colleges and universities, Mr. Pritchett said, "This omission, however, is unavoidable since it is impossible to compare the cost of teaching in institutions where teaching is an economic function with that in institutions where the teachers serve in the main without salary. But this fact itself is one of great significance in the discussion of the question." Yes, it is of a significance even greater than Mr. Pritchett seems to appreciate. It is quite true that "the Roman Catholic Church has in education, as in other fields, a well-thought-out policy. It has met the problem of educational administration with full appreciation of the fact that, if it meant to control colleges, and to use them as agencies for the propagation of the faith, it must secure teachers who were independent of the ordinary financial obligations." This is quite true, but it is only a small part of the truth. She is conscious that the laborer is worthy of his hire, that the mother who brings children into the world should be supported by a devoted husband and should be blessed by the gratitude of her children, and so she has blessed marriage and thrown all her strength into the home to render it an enduring unit where the members might coöperate for a common purpose, and where the mother would be "independent of the ordinary financial obligations." And she has proceeded in like manner in education, the enlarged work of the home, and hence it is that her "college professors are, therefore, recruited from priests or from other members of celibate religious orders. These teachers could, however, not be drafted for this service if they were compelled to face the possibility of being turned out in old age upon the tender mercies of an indifferent world."

The Church has always held up her Divine Founder as the model Teacher, and she has lifted to the very highest plane of dignity and honor the work of teaching. Those who are called upon to take up this exalted work are incorporated into a religious society which is only a larger family wherein each member is freed from individual and sordid cares and can devote himself with all the energies of his life to the noble work of educating the children of men and transforming them into the

Startling as this schedule is, it does not tell the whole truth. The salary roll shows that the actual salary paid both the grammar grade and the primary teachers was less than that indicated. It was cut and raised several times during the ten years and thus kept dodging between eight and nine hundred dollars; only a few times in the ten years did it reach nine hundred dollars. And be it remembered that this was the maximum salary which presupposed many years of actual experience and several years of professional training. With a showing like this it is not surprising to find that our young men have abandoned the profession of teaching in our elementary schools. The few that are still to be found in the ranks are either making use of the school system to supply the needed revenue for a few years while they are preparing themselves outside of school hours for some other career, or they are the emasculated weaklings who find it to their taste to escape from the competition of men in earning a livelihood.

Where service is an economic function, the salary and other economic advantages indicate the level of the profession in question and judged by this standard, teaching has certainly lost caste. In Germany the case is otherwise. The man teacher, while paid only a moderate salary, is held in great esteem in the community and the State demands of him a professional training in keeping with the dignity of his office. He either possesses the degree of Doctor of Philosophy or is on the way to its reception. The dignity of his profession and the esteem in which it is held by his fellow men compensate in some measure for the meagerness of his income. In this country the opposite is the case. This phase of the problem was handled ably in the *Educational Review* for April, 1908, by C. W. Bardeen, in a paper to which we referred in the June number of the *Bulletin*. Some of the reasons which he there assigns for the abandonment of the teaching profession by men are well worth considering. The teacher is entirely at the mercy of his trustees. If he does not please them in every detail he is likely to be dropped and "what is worse, to be dropped is often permanent loss of occupation. Teaching is the only business over which the State has a monopoly. An

attorney or architect discharged by a school board may start in business in the same town, but a teacher who is dismissed from one school in the city is dismissed from all of them and must go elsewhere. Hence, teachers are wanderers; they buy a home only at the risk of being compelled any year to give it up. They are in a state of dependency upon trustees elected to office without special knowledge of the needs of the schools or the relative qualifications of teachers." It is easy to see why teamsters and bookkeepers, architects and stenographers, draughtsmen and secretaries receive large salaries and constant promotions. The State has no monopoly in their professions and hence must compete for their services and treat them with becoming civility. But the teacher has no redress. The work of teaching in itself is altogether apart from the ordinary vocations of men and does not fit for any other employment. It is a sacred vocation that is final in itself and if the State holds a monopoly and fails to lift the profession to its proper dignity, the blame rests with society. The teacher is deprived of his freedom by the machinery of the school system and his work is lowered in his own eyes by the meagerness of his compensation and the helplessness of his position, but this does not end with the school board. "Outside the board of education that directly employs him, the community feels authorized to dictate whether he shall smoke or dance or play cards or call on a lady twice a week. The present Principal of the High School in Newark, N. J., lost a place in Courtland Normal School because when he applied he was wearing a red necktie; the chairman of the committee disliked red neckties." The teacher is felt to be not only a public servant but a public servant whom every body believes himself qualified to criticise and dictate to. In other vocations men may sometimes, at least, be their own master. They can come and go when they like, and do what they like, provided they respect the laws of the land. And in this large freedom they find avenues of advancement opening up to them just in proportion to their talents and energy. But all this is reversed in the teaching profession. To quote once more from Professor Bardeen, "teaching is looked down upon in the community. We might

as well face the fact. 'When A. was principal of a grammar school,' said the head of a normal school, 'he would run across the street to shake hands with me. Now that he has passed the law examination and hung up his shingle, he expects me to run across the street to shake hands with him.' In other words, A. feels that to be the tail of the law is higher than to be at the top of teaching. . . . The teacher may have a personality that commands respect in spite of his calling, but as a teacher and outside of his especial work he is regarded by business men slightly, as an improvident visionary, thinking in a world of imaginary conditions, like Alice in Wonderland."

The Professor then goes on to point out that the teaching profession actually unfits a man for any other line of work and he concludes that this is the reason that so few teachers are ever elected to responsible positions in the commonwealth. He then passes to a consideration of another and a very serious phase of the subject. "Teaching usually belittles a man. I do not say it ought to; I do not say it always does; I say it usually does. His daily dealing is with petty things, of interest only to his children and a few women assistants, and under regulations laid down by outside authority, so that large questions seldom come to him for consideration. His environment narrows him, he grows to have only one interest, and that limits him in public and social life." On peril of losing his position he is compelled to trim his policies to suit each political change that alters the personnel of the school board until in time he loses all grasp of principle and all esteem for his profession. Now, if this is true of the teachers in secondary schools and of principals in the elementary schools, the case is far worse with the teaching staff of the elementary schools. We are not here dealing with theory but with the facts which confront us, with facts which have already driven the talented and ambitious men out of the teaching profession, at least out of the ranks of the teachers in our elementary schools and have filled their places with women. This state of affairs and the consequences which it leads to are attracting wide-spread attention at present.

THE CATHOLIC EDUCATIONAL ASSOCIATION.

No movement in behalf of Catholic education, since the foundations of our school system were laid in Colonial days, has attracted more attention or possesses more interest for our people or gives greater promise for Catholic education than The Catholic Educational Association, which held its fifth annual meeting at Cincinnati, Ohio, last July. The Secretary-General, Rev. Francis Howard, deserves the thanks of all concerned for the splendid report of the proceedings which he has recently issued to the members of the Association. It is more complete than any of the preceding reports. Those who were not privileged to attend the sessions of the association will find in the 480 pages of this report a full and faithful account of the discussions in the various sections, nor are these the only ones who will hail with joy this faithful record of the proceedings. The several departments held their sessions simultaneously and as a consequence the delegates were compelled to choose between several papers each of which possessed vital interest for them.

A comparison of the present report with that of former years shows that the members of the Association are drawing nearer year by year to the heart of the great problems which must be solved by our Catholic educational institutions of every rank. There is a notable absence of special pleading throughout the papers and an evident desire on the part of the participants to face the issues squarely. But perhaps the most encouraging feature of the movement is to be found in the growing consciousness on the part of our Catholic educators of the need of union and coöperation among our schools of all ranks and of all parts of the country. This is shown by the growing membership and by the more representative character of the delegates. "Seven hundred and sixty-seven delegates registered at the meeting and many of these represent colleges, academics, and communities of teachers." We heartily agree with Father Howard in his brief and pointed introduction when he says:

“The usefulness of these meetings is now generally recognized. They give us an understanding of the strength and weakness of our educational position that can be obtained in no other way. A great deal of earnest and serious work is done at these meetings; they foster a spirit of unity and coöperation in all departments of our educational work; and they inspire our educators with a greater love and devotion to their calling. It is the opinion of all who attend the meetings that the whole system of our educational activity has been strengthened, unified and developed by the annual conventions of the Association, and more especially has this been the result of the meeting in Cincinnati.”

A perusal of the papers contained in this volume will also make it evident that not only are Catholic educators realizing more clearly than ever before the need of coöperation, but they are coming to a fuller understanding of the fundamental principles on which our Catholic educational system rests. Whatever differences may exist in the details of method, there is unity of fundamental principles. As a consequence of this there is a growing realization of the danger that lurks in the affiliation of our schools to non-Catholic institutions. The philosophy underlying an educational system must inevitably express itself in all phases of its work and hence our Catholic institutions must find within themselves guidance and helpfulness. Coöperation and mutual helpfulness are needed to safeguard our weaker institutions against the danger of straying in pursuit of false ideals. Father Howard expresses a thought that has often been expressed in these pages when he says: “Of more importance even than the thoroughness of our educational work is the defence of the general interests of Catholic education and the vindication of the principles on which it is based. The secular system of education is based largely on the theory that man is born for the State and that he derives his rights from the State. The Socialist would have the State absorb all authority in the domain of learning and of industry, and there are many secular educators who would fain see the monopoly of education lodged in the power of the State. The Catholic system is based on the right of the parent,

the right of the child, and a reasonable individualism. . . . The importance of the Association is also apparent in view of the most portentous evil in American life—the decay of religion. Religion has practically disappeared in a very large element of the American people and we are facing an entirely new situation in our national life. The most vital work and the most urgent problem in American life is the preservation of religion; and the responsibility of preserving the Catholic faith in our people and religion in our country rests upon those who are charged with the work of Catholic education. Our Catholic people live in an atmosphere of irreligion and paganism. The American nation is losing religion because it has eliminated religion from the schools of the nation. Catholic people spend millions of dollars every year in their educational work, but it is sacrifice made for natural right and for the preservation of religion in our country.”

Archbishop Moeller, who has shown his interest in Catholic education in so many ways, welcomed the Association to Cincinnati in an address which is replete with wisdom and which should be read by every educator in the country, whether Catholic or non-Catholic. He emphasizes in particular what our people too often forget that in striving to realize the ideals of Catholic education we are laboring at the same time to develop the ideal citizen of the republic. “It would be difficult to sufficiently praise you for the service which you are rendering the country. What is it that gives dignity and permanence to the State? What will save it from internal dissensions and rebellion that menace its existence? Will wealth, or learning, or power of a large and well disciplined army? The wrecks that mark the ways of time teach the lesson that a nation may not depend on riches, culture or power and hope to live. Religion, the truths of God, the unchangeable principles of morality, are the soul of every government, give it life and inspire it with noble and lofty ideals and insure its permanency. . . . Next to the ministers of God none contribute more to the preservation and extension of the faith than our Catholic educators. Clergy and laity are convinced that to

sever religion from education would be detrimental to the faith."

This well merited tribute to the work of our teaching orders was voiced in many ways throughout the discussions of the convention. Bishop Maes, in his remarks at the opening session, said: "It is not often that we have an opportunity of sounding the praises of those modest teachers who are ever kept from publicity, but who work day after day, from morning till night and from night till morning, striving to become more and more perfect in their profession. The thanks of the Bishops—and I may here presume to speak in the name of all the Bishops of the United States—and the thanks of every priest are due to those self-sacrificing brothers and sisters who are making Catholic education their life's vocation, and do it out of pure love for God and for the souls of our children. So great is their influence that I do not hesitate to say that it is in their hands that lies the future of the Church in the United States."

In the vocation of our teachers we have, indeed, an asset that far out-weighs all the advantages of wealth and State aid. Where education is not a vocation but an economic function, it is not possible to secure the same breadth or freedom of thought, the same zeal and professional spirit or the disinterestedness and self-sacrifice which is indispensable in the teacher where education is to reach a high level of moral and intellectual culture.

Dr. Pace, in his paper at the first general session, throws into the foreground the same asset. "I feel the more encouraged in this course when I consider the spirit of our Catholic teachers. Were it a question of arousing interest, or of spurring endeavor or even of pleading for greater self-sacrifice, an appeal of quite a different sort would be needed. Likewise, if our main object were success as against strong competition or financial gain to piece out our slender resources, it would be at once easier and wiser to offer a scheme based solely on prudent calculation. Happily, however, no such situation confronts us. There is neither apathy to be rebuked nor self-seeking to be put to shame. There is instead, a determina-

tion to make our schools as perfect as possible and a willingness to profit by example and suggestion from whatever source these may come."

The papers in every section are encouraging from the progress in all departments of our educational work of which they speak. In speaking of the improvements in method, Dr. Pace says: "For the Catholic teacher there is a special consideration arising from the fact that the teaching of religion is an essential part of our school work. The conviction is growing, and has more than once been expressed, that religious truths must not be held apart from the general body of knowledge which the mind assimilates, but must become a vital and a dominant element in the mental structure. Hence it follows, obviously, that the importance of method and of professional training is to be gauged not alone by the value of the ordinary school subjects but above all by the supreme value of religious truth. In other words, if religion is to be taught by the methods employed in the secular branches, those methods, for an additional reason, must be the very best, and their application must be marked by consummate skill. When and so far as this is done, when the truths and moral precepts of Christianity are so thoroughly interwoven into the thought and feeling of each man and woman as to exert a practical influence on every action, Catholic education will have done a perfect work."

But this convention did not occupy itself exclusively with recording progress. One of its most valuable results was the clear light in which it placed the problems which still remain to be solved and the difficulties and dangers which confront us. The key-note of this situation was struck by the Right Reverend President-General in his opening remarks: "The more I study this subject of education the more profoundly convinced I feel of two things—that it is the most important problem that confronts the Catholic Church to-day, and that, far from having arrived at a solution, we are simply at the beginning of the difficulty." The difficulties here spoken of were touched upon in Dr. Pace's paper on "The Present State of Education," in the discussion which followed it, and in many of the discussions of the special sections, particularly in the school sec-

tion. To quote again from Dr. Pace: "There is reason to believe, or rather there are plain facts to show, that our teachers, especially in the secondary schools, are eager for every possible means of improvement. But the question is: do they find these means within the Catholic system? If they are obliged to seek aid from outside sources, then, clearly there is a defect somewhere. A system that has not within itself adequate means of supplying its own vital elements with needed energy is a system only in name. Doubtless too, some of our schools are in process, and not a slow one, of coördination so far as methods, standards, inspection, registration and credits are concerned. But does this mean that they are coördinate parts of our Catholic system? Certain it is that our teachers are familiar in some degree with current educational literature, and that they make use to a considerable extent of the latest and most improved text-books. Those of us who listened to the discussion at Milwaukee last summer may recall some significant statements and admissions bearing on this very point. All of us know, moreover, how often and how eagerly the desire for Catholic text-books has been expressed. But the real reason why they are not forthcoming, has yet to be stated." Speaking of the reasons why we have so little educational literature and why non-Catholic educational literature finds such ready access to our schools, he says: "They find readers, in growing numbers, among Catholic teachers as well; and inevitably, though imperceptibly, they turn the thoughts of our teachers into lines that are parallel, if not identical, with the ideas that pervade the general system. Is it to be wondered at that our schools incline more and more to some sort of affiliation with the institutions from which that literature emanates, in which those methods are being constanly worked over, and in which better, or at any rate different plans of study are being drawn up? . . . The plain man who is little concerned about educational theories, will quickly enough ask why his children should get their elementary training in a Catholic school if that school draws its strength mainly from affiliation with outside institutions. He knows nothing perhaps about 'coördination' and the 'unitary character' of education; but

it seems to him the commonest of common sense that the boy or girl should as soon as possible get into the system that carries him right through to the end. And he is likely to be confirmed in this view when he sees that Catholic schools, in the essential things, are not altogether outside the general system."

We have difficulties to face and we are surrounded by dangers, but we can rely upon our army of trained and devoted teachers to adhere steadfastly to Catholic ideals and whatever wandering beyond the line may occur in the storm and stress, we may be sure of a speedy return as soon as the danger is realized. We need unity and strength in our educational system, but the unity must come rather from a recognition of common fundamental principles than through legislative enactments or coercive measures and our strength will be abundant when we turn to general use the educational power that is now locked away in the brains of individual teachers scattered through the teaching communities of this country. We need our own text-books and our own educational literature and when that need is fully realized there will be at hand an abundant supply of both the one and the other and the quality will not be inferior to the best that is produced by the hired teachers in a State school system.

THOMAS EDWARD SHIELDS.

BOOK REVIEWS.

Essays Philosophical and Psychological in honor of William James, Professor in Harvard University, by his colleagues at Columbia University. New York : Longmans, 1908. Pp. viii + 610. Price, \$3.00 net.

A healthy tone of Realism characterizes this important contribution to contemporary philosophical literature. Those who have learned how much courage is required nowadays in order to profess a philosophy which agrees with the convictions of "the plain man," will readily acknowledge that an open profession of Realism by the authors of this volume will be sure to have a salutary influence. We are reminded, indeed, that "In philosophy it is not the same thing to be in the right and to be in the fashion." Yet that "*Athanasius contra mundum*" is no longer the position of the Realist, must have the effect of removing one of the greatest difficulties in the way of restoring philosophy to a cordial and intelligible agreement with the physical, biological, and historical sciences. Too long has philosophy been "the most irresponsible of sciences;" too long has extravagance of theory been its gravest fault. It is indeed time "to renounce the splendid follies of speculative imagination and return to intellectual seriousness." It is time, in a word, for epistemology and metaphysics to cry *peccavi* and to acknowledge that Cartesian subjectivism is at the root of all the aberrant tendencies of unreal metaphysics. To many minds, it is true, Idealism appeals because of a false though widespread association of the name Idealism with ideals in religion, conduct, and artistic production. To such minds it comes as a shock to learn that nothing is more destructive of ideals than Idealism, and that the swinging of philosophic thought in the direction of the spontaneous belief in a "World as it is" corresponding to the "World represented" means the re-enforcement of the bulwarks of sane philosophy, which alone stands between our ideals and the destructive onrush of scepticism, agnosticism, and the flippant despair of knowing anything. Of course, there is Realism and Realism. No realist would nowadays maintain that "world as it is, is directly revealed in its fulness to the mind of man;" but for

every attempt to convince us that there is a "transubjective reference" in our perceptions and that to them there corresponds a physical world, we are truly and duly grateful. Professor Woodbridge in the article on "Perception and Epistemology" goes to the root of the matter when he writes, "If the processes belong to a world entirely physical, the 'representations' belong to a world at least partly physical. In other words, if there is a physical world external to consciousness, there is also a physical world within consciousness"—the union of subject and object in the act of knowing, as the Aristotelians taught. In the volume before us we remark also the note of pragmatism. Professor Dewey's article on "Reality as Practical," which follows Professor Fullerton's excellent article on "The New Realism," emphasizes this phase of contemporary thought. To the old theory of knowledge which, he says, has been systematically built up on the notion of a static universe, Professor Dewey opposes the new theory which makes "stress and strain, strife and satisfaction" the tests of validity, thus summing up the pragmatic view of reality as possessing a practical character.

There are many things in this volume which we can safely recommend to all who are interested in the ever-recurring problems of epistemology, psychology and metaphysics. The work is a noble and a graceful tribute to Professor James, whose position in the world of philosophy here and in Europe is one of well-earned honor, and, evidently, to those who know him personally, of singular, if not unique, esteem. The book is faultless from the point of view of material workmanship.

WILLIAM TURNER.

The Popes and Science. The History of the Papal Relations to Science during the Middle Ages and down to Our Own Time, by James J. Walsh, M. D., Ph. D., LL. D., Professor of History of Medicine at Fordham University School of Medicine, etc. New York: Fordham University Press, 1908. Pp. xii + 431. Price, \$2.00 net.

That dissection was prohibited by Papal authority, that anatomy was declared "a sin against the Holy Ghost," that chemistry was forbidden under the severest penalties, that the medieval miracles of healing checked medical science, that the practice of surgery was held in suspicion and contempt—these are not mere popular preju-

dices, the fallacies of shallow dabblers in ecclesiastical controversy. They are brought forward as a part of serious arraignment of the Church and the Papacy in Dr. Andrew D. White's *Warfare of Science with Theology*. The refutation of them is the scope and subject-matter of the volume before us, in which Dr. Walsh meets calumny with calm statement and confronts misinformation with the testimony of reliable and in most cases contemporary documents. The author has, in our opinion, succeeded not only in proving a contradictory but in proving a contrary. He has shown that when allowance is made for the "popular" feeling of horror and suspicion, the triumph of anatomy and surgery owes much to the enlightened and liberal patronage extended to medical science by the Popes. The career of Vesalius, and his relations with ecclesiastical authorities form, to our way of thinking, the best and most striking refutation of Dr. White's allegations.

The volume is dedicated to His Holiness Pius X. It is well printed, and provided with a useful index.

WILLIAM TURNER.

Report of the Proceedings and Addresses of the Fifth Annual Meeting of the Catholic Educational Association. Columbus, Ohio, 1908. Pp. xiii + 480.

Crescit eundo seems to be the motto of the Catholic Educational Association. In the number of its members, in the attendance at its meetings, in the interest which its work arouses, in the size and importance of its Reports there is a very decided growth from year to year, a growth which is a very pleasing sign of the progress we are steadily making towards the unification of effort, coördination of programme and hearty coöperation in the difficult task of building up our educational system. The volume before us cannot be too earnestly recommended to teachers, to the members of the parochial and regular clergy and above all to the pastors, whose care for the souls of their people includes the all important duty towards the schools for which the faithful are making so great a sacrifice. A more extended notice of the volume will be found under the heading "Notes on Education." Copies of the volume may be had from the General Secretary of the Association, 1651 Main Street, Columbus, Ohio.

WILLIAM TURNER.

The True Rationalism. A Lecture delivered in the University of Glasgow before St. Ninian's Society, by the Reverend M. Power, S. J., B. A. St. Louis : Herder, 1908. Pp. 68.

This is a brief but comprehensive statement of the claims of Reason within the limits of orthodox belief. To those who have made a study of the system of philosophy which is associated with the names of Aristotle, St. Thomas and Albertus Magnus, it will not come as a new thing, this plea for the headship of Reason in matters philosophical. Distinguishing true Rationalism from false, the lecturer contends that "The one great human force to keep us in the old paths of the Faith in Rationalism"—a thesis which is more timely than ever to-day when so many are trying to point out the dangers of just that kind of Rationalism.

WILLIAM TURNER.

Psychologie de l'incroyant, par Xavier Moisan. Paris : Beauchesne, 1908. 12mo, 339 pp.

What is the mental and moral attitude of the unbeliever towards the Christian religion whose claims he rejects? This question the author has tried to answer by analyzing the three types of unbelief in which he thinks all can be comprised who will not accept the Christian faith. One type he finds exemplified in the deist Voltaire, the witty but narrow scoffer, skilled in arguments of ridicule but contemptible for his pessimism, irritable temper, excessive vanity, low moral tone, and his blindness to the wonderful vitality and moral heroism of the Church of Christ.

A second type is to be seen in the positivist Comte, who while rejecting Christian belief and even deistic philosophy, recognized that the religious craving in man is a legitimate need, and sought to meet it with a creation of his own that should embody the high morality and the saint-veneration of Catholicism together with the accredited results of positive, scientific research.

The third type he finds illustrated in the philosopher Renouvier, the passionate lover of individual liberty, the irreconcilable enemy of clericalism, an ardent believer in immortality not of the Christian type, and in a divine personality subject to anthropomorphic limitations, a thinker so far from Christian, and so near to Pla-

tonic, thought, that the author does not hesitate to pronounce him "un philosophe grec attardi en pays chrétien."

The analytic study of these three types is made with no little skill, and is at the same time set forth in a lucid and attractive style. But the concluding chapter, in which he essays a definition of the unbeliever on the basis of these types, leaves an unsatisfactory impression on the reader by its vagueness. One is led to ask, why should so unique a thinker as Renouvier be put up as a type of the modern unbeliever? Might not other types far more appropriate have been found,—as for example, the type of the socialist unbeliever, represented by such men as Proudhon, Marx, Bebel; and the type of the scientific enthusiast, like Huxley, Haeckel, Flammarion, to whom science is all sufficient and the sole medium of certain knowledge?

CHARLES F. AIKEN.

Apologie scientifique de la foi chrétienne, d'après l'ouvrage de Mgr. Duilhé de Saint Projet, entièrement refondu, par J.-B. Senderens. Paris : Poussielgue, 1908. 12mo, 444 pp.

The distinguished author of the *Scientific Apology of Christian Faith* was one of the few clear sighted apologists of a generation ago who knew how to distinguish between what is of faith and what is of traditional opinion in the current theological teaching on questions largely scientific, and who had the courage to meet the legitimate claims of the natural sciences with sympathy and fairness. It is greatly to his credit that despite the rapid march of geology, biology, and anthropology in the last twenty-four years, his book is still one of the best apologies in the field of natural science.

It is not surprising that after so long a period, the work, in some of the questions treated, should have fallen behind. In order to remedy these defects and to bring the apology up to date, the Abbé Senderens has seen fit to modify it considerably. The methodical arrangement of the original has been in great measure retained. By omitting two of the introductory chapters on the method of treatment, and the obsolete chapter on the concordist interpretation of the opening chapters of Genesis, as well as by pruning portions of the text in other chapters, he has reduced the

bulk of the book by one hundred pages, and that, too, while adding a chapter of his own on the plurality of inhabited worlds.

His changes are for the most part judicious. Yet one cannot help thinking that the work of revision could have been better done. In the chapters dealing with transformism, parts of the original have been dropped that one might wish to see retained. The room now taken up by the speculative question of the inhabitation of other worlds might better have been given to a larger treatment of prehistoric archæology. Again, it is to be regretted that no bibliography accompanies the revised edition. An index, too, would have enhanced its usefulness. But notwithstanding these failings, the *Scientific Apology*, in its new dress, will not fail to command respect and to prove of great service.

CHARLES F. AIKEN.

Commentaire français littéral de la somme théologique de Saint Thomas d'Aquin. Par le R. P. Thomas Pègues, O. P., Lecteur en Théologie. Edouard Privat, 14 Rue des Arts, Toulouse. Tome 2 ; *Traité de la Trinité* (7.50 fr.).

The first two volumes of Father Pègues' valuable work, a translation of the Summa of St. Thomas and a commentary on the text, have already been noticed in the pages of the *Bulletin* (see January, 1908). Those volumes dealt with the first twenty-six questions of the Summa. The second tome (vol. 3) gives a remarkably lucid and learned exposition of St. Thomas' treatise on the mystery of the Trinity (1 P., QQ. 27-43). Pope Pius X graciously accepted the offering of the first two volumes, and addressed to the author an encouraging Brief, from which we extract the following significant words: "Consilium probamus tuum lingua dicendique genere patriis, quae praestant, quam quae maxime, lumine, principis exponendi de Theologia operis, hodie praesertim accomodatissimi, quando qui a Thoma discedunt, iidem videntur eo ad ultimum agi ut ab Ecclesia desciscant: studium ad haec dilaudamus, quo rem rite curasti exequendam." These words were written on November 7th, 1908. On September 8th of the same year the Supreme Pontiff addressed to the whole world in the famous letter "Pascendi dominici gregis," the following admonition: "Philosophiam scholasticam quum sequendam praescribi-

mus, eam praecipue intelligimus, quae a sancto Thoma Aquinate est tradita; de qua quidquid a Decessore Nostro sancitum est, id omne vigere volumus, et qua sit opus instauramus et confirmamus, stricteque ab universis servari jubemus . . . Magistros autem monemus ut rite hoc teneant, Aquinatem deserere, praesertim in re metaphysica, non sine magno detrimento esse." Father Pègues, naturally, is very much encouraged in the fulfillment of his arduous task, by the words of the Supreme Pontiff.

Apart from this, the talent and learning, the familiarity with his subject, the genius which he displays in presenting in an easy, attractive style the most abstruse questions of theology, the sound judgment shown in giving, with the translation, just enough of commentary to make his work an up-to-date manual, are in themselves perfections which should commend his volume to all those who love solid theology and are anxious to know how theological questions were treated by the Prince of theologians. We predict that Father Pègues' work will be deeply appreciated not only by students but even by professors. The author is a master of theology, intimately acquainted with every part of the *Summa*, and his genius for lucid exposition cannot be surpassed. The volumes thus far published have been most highly praised by the leading theological reviews of Europe, especially in France, Belgium, Italy and Germany.

D. J. KENNEDY, O. P.

De Doctrina S. Joannis Evangelistae circa Baptismi Sacramentum. *Dissertatio theologico-ermeneutica quam ad doctoratus gradum in sacra theologia apud Seminarium S. Bernardi, Roffae consequendum scripsit Rev. Michael J. Ryan, S. T. L., Ph. D. Roffae, N. Y., 1908.*

In this dissertation Doctor Ryan gives an explanation of the doctrine of St. John the Evangelist on the all-important sacrament of Baptism. His explanations of the various texts adduced are very ingenious, very interesting and very instructive. The Fathers of the Church did not hesitate to base their instructions on mystical interpretations of the sacred writings. Preachers and writers of our days also may make use of mystical interpretations, for—to use a style of argument approved by Dr. Ryan—"The letter killeth but the spirit quickeneth" (2 Cor., III, 6). We must be

very careful, however, in passing from proposing for the edification of the faithful the beauties of the mystical meanings, which God may have intended to convey when He inspired the sacred writers, to the solid, sober fact of adducing arguments in proof of the doctrines which we profess. "Et sic nulla confusio sequitur in sacra Scriptura, cum omnes sensus fundentur super unum, scilicet litteralem, ex quo solo potest trahi argumentum, non autem ex iis quae secundum allegoriam dicuntur, ut dicit Augustinus" (S. Th. 1, P. Q. 1, art. x ad 1^{um}). Dr. Ryan exercises this caution; he reminds his readers that "sensus doctrinales sacrae Scripturae imponi sine auctoritate non debent" (p. 15); hence he cites authorities when his argument is based on the mystical meaning of the text. Since the authorities do not agree, his thesis has not that stability which we find in theses that rest on the literal meaning of the sacred writings. "Very beautiful, probably true, but not proved," might be the verdict of some hard-hearted scholastic who will not be convinced except by arguments based on the literal meaning of the inspired text. However that may be, the author has rendered a service by recalling interpretations that have been forgotten, and by pointing out hidden beauties which all men should admire in 1 John v, 6, 8 (verse 7 prudently omitted); John xix, 34; John vii, 37, 38 (punctuation changes the meaning); 1 Cor. x, 2, 4; John iv, 13, 14; John iii, 5.

In stating (ch. x) as more probable the opinion which holds that the sacrament of Baptism was not instituted before the passion of our Saviour, Dr. Ryan is setting himself against the majority of theologians.

The dissertation manifests valuable, patient research and reflects credit on the author and on the seminary of Rochester.

D. J. KENNEDY, O. P.

The History of the Passion of our Lord Jesus Christ,
explained and applied to the Christian life by James Groenings,
S. J. Second English edition prepared from the fourth German
edition. B. Herder, St. Louis, Mo., 1908. 8°, pp. xiv + 461.
\$1.25.

As the title indicates Father Groenings' book is a description and explanation of the principal events in the history of the Re-

deemer's suffering and death. The various incidents of the sacred Passion, beginning with the agony in the garden and concluding with the watch at the tomb, are presented, as far as can be determined, in their chronological succession. An appropriate text from one of the Gospels supplies the subject matter of each chapter. In the commentary on those texts, the exegetical material is chosen with a view to edification and useful instruction, a few of the more difficult points of interpretation being summarily treated in the appendix at the end of the volume. The author's method of treatment is popular throughout and it does not come within the scope of his work to deal explicitly with these mooted questions. Numerous reflections of a practical character are found in every chapter of the book which affords excellent matter for meditation.

P. ALOYSIUS MENGES, O. S. B.

Das Evangelium von Gottessohn. Eine Apologie der wesentlichen Gottessohnschaft Christi gegenüber der Kritik der modernsten deutschen Theologie, von Dr. Theol. et Phil. Anton Seitz. Freiburg im Breisgau : Herder, 1908. 8vo, pp. xii + 545. \$1.85.

The doctrine of Christ as the Logos, and of His eternal and essential oneness with God is the foundation of Christianity. Unfortunately the majority of the modern reconstructions of the life of Christ are dominated by a false philosophy which leaves no room for His Divinity. Under the circumstances the work of the apologist becomes more difficult as it increases in importance. Not only must he establish the proofs of Revelation objectively, convincingly and scientifically, he must also seek to obtain a hearing for the truth and to make it generally understood. To attain this end he has to expose religious doctrines relatively to the needs of the time, a task which presupposes a thorough knowledge of the current trend of thought. Dr. Seitz has produced a volume that comes up to these requirements. He is familiar with the immense literature dealing with the central figure of the Gospels and knows how to select judiciously where completeness is almost impossible. His method is determined by the apologetic scope of his work. In proving the Divinity of our Lord he lays stress

in particular on the central point of contention, where modern criticism has placed the issue, the testimony of Jesus to Himself. Christ frequently expressed Himself in a manner which definitely shows the consciousness of His messianic dignity and of His divine Sonship. That these terms imply more than a mere ethical relationship to God the Father is clearly set forth. There is no essential difference of meaning between the Sonship of Jesus as presented in St. John and that which is recognized in the earlier Gospels. St. John's version does no more than to bring into stronger relief the teaching of the synoptists. We have furthermore the direct professions of faith elicited by Christ from His followers and a number of indirect proofs which confirm the truth of the fundamental dogma of our Catholic Christology. Finally there is the testimony of the apostle Paul. The author pays due regard to questions of literary and historical criticism and is careful to emphasize only that which has an unquestionable claim to consideration. In an introductory chapter he describes the methods and principles of the Rationalist school of thinkers in general, and more specifically the undogmatic nature of Christianity as presented in Harnack's "*Wesen des Christentums*." The volume is deserving of attention not only on account of its well-timed appearance, but also on account of the excellence of its contents.

P. ALOYSIUS MENGES, O. S. B.

The Catholic Encyclopedia, Vol. IV. Clancy—Diocesan Chancery.
Robert Appleton Company (New York, 1908). Pp. i-xv + 799.

The fourth volume of the Catholic Encyclopedia which has recently been issued is in no respect inferior to the splendid volumes which have preceded it and in a few minor details at least it marks an advance. The maps are particularly good and the busy reader will welcome the list of articles appended to each name in the alphabetical index of contributors at the beginning of the volume. The Catholics of the English speaking world are beginning to realize the magnitude of the work that is being carried on so successfully by the editors of this admirable encyclopedia. None but the scholar could have realized the necessity of a work of this kind. Since the Reformation English literature along many lines has in

large measure passed out of the hands of Catholics and it fails completely to do justice to the doctrines, the legislation, the ritual, the constitution or the history of the Church. As the successive volumes of the Encyclopedia appear English speaking Catholics realize more and more the rich treasures of art, literature, science, etc., that are theirs—their hearts cannot fail to respond with gratitude and pride, and those who have the ability will be stimulated in the work of creating a new and distinctively Catholic literature in English along many lines.

The articles in this fourth volume cover a very wide range of interesting topics. Christian Archaeologists and students of Church History will find the twenty-two pages devoted to the article Cross teeming with interest. The authoritative character of the work is sufficiently guaranteed by the scholarship of the three men who contributed this article, Orazio Marucchi, Fernand Cabrol and Herbert Thurston. But it is not only the scholar who will turn for help to these pages: the multitude of Sisters and Brothers, priests and teachers to whom is committed the important work of teaching the religion of Jesus Christ to the little ones will find in this article a wealth of suggestive material organized around the symbol of Redemption. Biblical scholars and historians will turn eagerly to the articles on Biblical and Historical Criticism for light on the Church's attitude towards many of the problems which are at present occupying the attention of scholars and they will not be disappointed with the few brief but well ordered pages from the pens of Professor Reid and Prat who have contributed the article on the higher criticism and textual criticism of the Bible, nor with the splendid article on historical criticism by Father Charles De Smedt, S. J. The article on Confirmation is not only of vital interest to teachers of Christian Doctrine but to theologians and students of Church History as well. It is valuable not only for the light which it sheds on the meaning of this sacrament and the place which it holds at present in sacramental Theology but as a splendid illustration of the development of doctrine and ritual in the Church. It has an added interest to a large section of the readers of the Encyclopedia from the light which it sheds upon the development of the Irish and British Churches. The profusely illustrated article on Christopher Columbus from the pen of Adolph F. Bandelier will interest all Americans and will prove helpful to the teachers of American history in our schools. The lovers of Dante will delight in the

beautiful illustrations which accompany this article and the brief, clear story of the life and work of the poet. The theologian and the lawyer will be interested in such articles as those on Contracts, Consanguinity and Compensation, while a much wider interest attaches at present to the article on Concordats, owing to the recent break between the Church and the French Government. The article on Clandestinity will be turned to eagerly by a great many Catholics on account of the recent legislation by the Holy See on that subject.

Catholics of the English speaking world have grown so accustomed to the misrepresentation and caricature of the things which they hold most sacred that it will take them some time to come to a full realization of what the Encyclopedia is destined to do for them. A multitude of writers have misrepresented things Catholic, not through malice or bigotry, but through ignorance of the facts. It is true that Catholics frequently knew where to turn for authentic information on the subjects in question, but the non-Catholic was at the mercy of the literature at his disposal and this was frequently poisoned in its source. Hereafter this will not be true, for all those outside the Church who want to know will find the facts and the key to the sources of more detailed information in the pages of the Catholic Encyclopedia.

THOMAS EDWARD SHIELDS.

BOOK NOTICES.

Father Bernard Vaughan, whose sermons have of late attracted so much attention here and in England, writes the Preface to a little volume of ninety-one pages on *SERMON COMPOSITION* by Rev. Geo. Hitchcock, S. J. (New York, Benziger, 1908). To the summary of qualities which a good sermon, according to St. Thomas, should possess, namely Solidity (*stabilitas*), Luminosity (*claritas*) and Usefulness (*utilitas*), Father Vaughan adds a fourth requirement, Up-to-date-ness (*Actualitas*). The choice of a subject, the method of composition, the use of illustrations and anecdotes, the filling in of details, etc., are treated in this little volume in a way to interest and, we should think, benefit the young student of sacred eloquence.

Perhaps the most useful kind of preaching nowadays is the expository, or what is sometimes misleadingly called the didactic, sermon. People seem to need more than anything else, to be instructed on the teachings of the Church. A series of Sermons on the Creed, on the Commandments, on the Sacraments, on the Ceremonies of the Church, in a word, a larger and more mature Catechism of Christian Doctrine expounded from the pulpit, is what many experienced pastors find to be most beneficial to their flocks. Besides, the evident wish of His Holiness Pius X that the teaching of Christian doctrine be not confined to instructing the children of the parish, but be extended to the instruction of grown up members of the flock furnishes an additional reason for this style of preaching. An admirable series on the doctrines of the Church, by various well known preachers published by Wagner, New York, and entitled *THE CREED*, is part of a projected course entitled *Pulpit Commentary on Catholic Teaching*. It ought to be of use to those who contemplate a series of sermons on doctrinal subjects.

The second volume of Father Brancherau's *MEDITATIONS FOR THE USE OF SEMINARIANS AND PRIESTS* comes to us from the Press of Benziger Brothers, New York. For the work of the translator, who has, we notice, considerably abridged the original and wisely adapted the meditations to the temperament and needs of English and American students, we have nothing but praise. The presswork, however, is hardly up to the standard of the Benziger Company.

We have seldom seen a more beautiful piece of typographical work than that in which Benziger Brothers put before us a new edition of the *IMITATION OF CHRIST*. The edition is prefaced by a Life of Thomas a Kempis and a collection of "Eulogies or Praises" of the Imitation. In everything except the binding, which is plain, though tastefully lettered, the volume is an *édition de luxe*. The price is two dollars.

An author less known than Thomas a Kempis, though deserving to be known better than he is, is Gerard of Zutphen, a countryman of Thomas, and like him, a Brother of the Common Life. Gerard's best work is that entitled *Beatus homo*, (the words of its *incipit*) commonly called, THE SPIRITUAL ASCENT. A translation of this valuable treatise on the spiritual life, by J. P. Arthur, prefaced by a life of Gerard from the pen of Thomas a Kempis has just been published by Benziger Brothers, New York.

A biography in the sense that it exhibits the best in the spiritual and administrative life of a very saintly priest, and at the same time a treatise on many of the virtues, natural and supernatural by the religious state—such is the volume published recently by Benziger Brothers, and entitled VIRTUES AND SPIRITUAL COUNSELS OF FATHER NOAILLES. The author is Father Eugene Baffie, O. M. I., and the translator is Father John Fitzpatrick, of the same Congregation. The life of the pious founder of "The Most Holy Family of Bordeaux" was replete with good works, and the wise maxims and prudent spiritual counsels with which he so successfully guided others in the difficult paths of supernatural virtue were the fruit of an extraordinarily close union with God, such as only the greatest of the mystics attained.

In the difficult yet fascinating task of discovering the spiritual in the material there is no guide more safe than the saintly Bishop of Geneva, the Founder of the Order of the Visitation. Among the papers which were found after his death was a mystical explanation of the Cantic of Canticles, which was first published in 1643. It now appears in an English translation by the late Canon Mackey, with a preface by the Archbishop of Westminster. We can heartily recommend to the clergy and to religious this MYSTICAL EXPLANATION OF THE CANTICLE OF CANTICLES COMPOSED BY BLESSED FRANCIS DE SALES. It is published in London by Burns and Oates and in New York by Benziger Brothers.

UNIVERSITY CHRONICLE.

Patronal Feast of the University. On Tuesday, December 8th, the Feast of the Immaculate Conception, the Patronal Feast of the University, was celebrated by a Solemn Pontifical Mass in the Chapel of Caldwell Hall. The celebrant was the Right Reverend Rector. The sermon was preached by Very Reverend Chrysostom Theobald, O. F. M. After Mass, the Deans of the Faculties, the Heads of the University Colleges and distinguished members of the local clergy were entertained at dinner at Caldwell Hall.

The A. O. H. Scholarships. The Ancient Order of Hibernians has already founded eight Scholarships at the University, and it is expected that before the end of the school year the number will reach twenty-five.

